

88: 2153

JPRS: 5910

20 November 1960

MARXIST-LENINIST DOCTRINE AND
HUMANITARIANISM

- COMMUNIST CHINA -

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

20000724 152

This material, translated under U.S. Government auspices, is distributed for scholarly uses to repository libraries under a grant/subscription arrangement with the Joint Committee on Contemporary China of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. The contents of this material in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government or the other parties to the arrangement. Queries regarding participation in this arrangement should be addressed to the Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, New York.

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
1636 CONNECTICUT AVE., N. W.

WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
DTC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

FOREWORD

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

SECRET

SUBSCRIBING REPOSITORIES

University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

State Paper Room
British Museum
London, W.C. 1, England

Center for Chinese Studies
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Government Publications Room
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

University of Chicago Library
Chicago 37, Illinois

Librarian, East Asiatic Library
Columbia University
New York 27, New York

Wason Collection
Cornell University Library
Ithaca, New York

Council on Foreign Relations
58 East 68th Street
New York 21, New York

Duke University Library
Durham, North Carolina

The Fletcher School of
Law and Diplomacy
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

Harvard College Library
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Center for East Asian Studies
Harvard University
16 Dunster Street
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Harvard-Yenching Institute
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

University of Hawaii
Honolulu 14, Hawaii

The Hoover Institution
Stanford, California

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois

Indiana University Library
Bloomington, Indiana

State University of Iowa Library
Iowa City, Iowa

Director, East Asian Institute
Columbia University
433 West 117th Street
New York 27, N. Y.

University of San Francisco
San Francisco 17, California

Librarian, School of Oriental and
African Studies
University of London
London, W.C. 1, England

Institute for Asian Studies
Marquette University
Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan

Continued

University of Minnesota Library
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Ohio State University Libraries
1858 Neil Avenue
Columbus 10, Ohio

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon

Pennsylvania Military College
Chester, Pennsylvania

University of Pittsburgh Library
Pittsburgh 13, Penna.

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey

Purdue University Libraries
Lafayette, Indiana

University of Rochester
Rochester 20, New York

Institute of Asian Studies
St. John's University Graduate School
Jamaica 32, New York

McKissick Memorial Library
University of South Carolina
Columbia 1, South Carolina

Seton Hall University
University College
South Orange, New Jersey

University of Southern Calif.
Library
Los Angeles 7, California

University of Texas Library
Austin 12, Texas

Alderman Library
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Far Eastern Library
University of Washington
Seattle 5, Washington

Yale University Library
New Haven, Connecticut

Asia Library
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Research Institute,
Sino-Soviet Bloc
P.O. Box 3521
Washington 7, D.C.

JPRS: 5910

CSO: 5140-N

MARXIST-LENINIST DOCTRINES AND
HUMANITARIANISM

[The following are full translations of
selected articles in Wen-i Pao (Literary Gazette)
and Hsin Chien-she (New Construction) of various
dates from March through July 1960.]

Table of Contents

<u>Article</u>	<u>Page</u>
The Authors of the Marxist-Leninist Classics on Critically Accepting the Cultural Tradition	1
Gorky on the Bourgeois Literary Heritage	49
Refuting Pa Jen's Modal Theory of "The Basic Nature of Mankind"	68
The Authors of the Marxist Classics on Bourgeois Humanitarianism	100
Gorky and Lu Hsiang on Humanitarianism and Human Nature	146
On the Artistic Vitality of the Classic Works and the So-called "Universal Human Nature"	175
The Struggle between Two World Outlooks on the Question of Human Nature	210
Criticizing the Bourgeois "Theory of Human Nature" .	248

THE AUTHORS OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST
CLASSICS ON CRITICALLY ACCEPTING THE
CULTURAL TRADITION

[The following is a full translation of an article entitled "Ma-k'o-ssu chu-i ching-tien tso-chia lun p'i-p'en-ti chi-ch'eng wen-hua ch'uan-t'ung" (English version above), appearing in Wen-i Pao (Literary Gazette), Peiping, No. 6, 26 Mar 60, pp 2-15.]

Wen-i Pao Editor's Comment: In dealing with the cultural heritage and the cultural tradition left over from the old age, the proletariat neither blindly reject them nor blindly worship them. Rather it uses the critical spirit of Marxism to scientifically evaluate and summarize them, distinguishing between the cream and the rubbish, and inherits those things which are still useful today. Without the thorough criticism of old culture, without the thorough remolding of the old tradition, and without the difficult task of doing away with the rotten and the picking out of the good, there will be no correct inheritance, and there will be no correct reform and creation.

We must adopt a critical attitude toward the rich heritage and the excellent traditions both in China and in foreign countries.

Modern revisionists and bourgeois literati have

incorrectly exploited the cultural heritage of the bourgeoisie of Europe, specially beautifying such portions of this heritage as are antagonistic toward the spirit of socialism and Communism. They have intentionally confused the basic differences between proletarian ideology and bourgeois ideology, between proletarian literature and art and bourgeois literature and art. They have created the cult of the blind worship of the bourgeois cultural tradition, and arbitrarily defined as permanently immutable the traditional ideas, viewpoints and concepts of bourgeois literature and art. All this constitutes a means with which they use bourgeois ideology to oppose proletarian ideology, and use bourgeois literature and art to oppose proletarian literature and art.

In order to critically inherit the bourgeois cultural legacy and cultural traditions, to attack the deceptive propaganda of the revisionists and the bourgeois literati, and to carry out to the end the struggle for the establishment of the proletariat and the elimination of the bourgeoisie in the realm of ideology, comrades in the literary and art circles must penetratingly understand the important writings of the authors of Marxist classics on the question of the cultural

heritage and cultural tradition. The set of materials presented here has been compiled to meet this need.

March 1960.

I. Spiritual Production Must Be Reformed in

Keeping with the Reform of Material Production

The people's ideas, viewpoints and conceptions, to put it briefly, their conception, must undergo changes with the changes in the living conditions of the people, the social relations of the people, and the social existence of the people. Is it necessary to have a specially brilliant mind to understand this?

Does not the history of thinking prove that spiritual production undergoes changes along with changes in material production? At any given age, the ruling ideology is nothing but the ideology of the ruling class.

People say that ideology can promote the revolution of society. But such a statement merely explains the following fact: when the factors for a new society have been evolved within the racks of the old society, the disintegration of the old ideology and the disintegration of old living conditions are developed simultaneously.

When the ancient age was on its way to extinction, Christianity liberated the various ancient religions. In the 18th century when Christianity was in turn plunged into the abyss of

destruction in face of the attack by the ideology of the revelation, the feudal society had developed a life-and-death struggle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie. The ideology of freedom of belief and freedom of religion merely indicated that the struggle for freedom occupied a dominating position in the realm of knowledge.

"However," - some people may say - "religious, moral, philosophical, political and legal views have naturally undergone changes in the course of the development of history. Nevertheless, religion, ethics, philosophy, politics and law in themselves have from beginning to end been preserved in the course of uninterrupted changes.

"Further, there are certain permanent truths, as freedom and righteousness. These are common to all the stages of the development of society. But Communism wants to abolish the permanent truths. It abolishes religion and ethics, not just reforming them. It can thus be seen that Communism runs counter to the course of the development of history entirely."

What is the meaning of such an attack? Up to now all social history has developed in the midst of the antithesis of classes, and in different ages the antithesis had different forms.

However, whatever the form of such antithesis, it is a common fact that in all past centuries that one group of people

exploits another group. It is therefore not at all strange to see that while the social consciousness may be different in each age, and there may be thousands of forms of this consciousness, there is a common pattern in development, one in which an ideological consciousness will only cease to exist after the class antithesis has been thoroughly eliminated.

The Communist revolution seeks to resolutely break down the relations of ownership left over from the past. It is therefore not at all strange to see that in the course of its own development it must most resolutely break down all past ideas.

(Extracts from Marx and Engels: Communist Manifesto, see "Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Volume IV, pp 488-489.)

In every age, the ideology of the ruling class is the ruling ideology. This is to say, the class which is the physical force that rules a society is at the same time the spiritual force of that social rule. The class that controls the materials for physical production at the same time controls the materials for spiritual production. Accordingly, generally speaking, the ideology of the peoples who do not possess the materials for production must be subservient to the ruling class.

The ideology of the ruling class is merely the manifestation of the ideas on material relationships of the class, the

material relationships manifested in ideological forms. Thus it is the manifestation of the relationships that enable the class in question to become the ruling class. It is thus the ruling ideology of that class. Of the individuals who constitute this class, there are some who have their own consciousness and can thus carry out thinking. They are precisely carrying out, on behalf of the class, the rule of and decision on the specific historical age. It goes without saying that they are doing the same thing in all realms of activities. That is to say, they are thinkers, producers of thought and also rulers. They manage the production and distribution of thought of the age. That is to say, their ideology is the ruling ideology of the age. For example, in a specific age the state power of the King, the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie struggle for the right of rule, and that rule is divided. In such a country, the theory of the division of ruling power has become the ruling ideology, and people all refer to it as "the permanent law."

Division of labor (which we have earlier stated as a major force in early history) is now also manifested in the ruling class in the form of mental labor and physical labor. So in this class, some of its members serve as the thinkers of the class (they are its active representatives adept in generalizing thought, people who make it their main source of living the production of the ideals of their class). At the same time

other members of the class adopt a somewhat negative stand on these thoughts and ideals, but are willing to accept them because the representatives first mentioned are the active members of the class and the others do not have the same amount of time to go about producing thoughts and ideals for their own good.

Within the class, the separation of the two groups may reach the stage in which they are to a certain extent antagonistic or even hostile toward each other. However, once they face a real conflict, the danger threatens the class as a whole, leading to the disappearance of that superficial phenomenon in which the ruling ideology appears to be not the ideology of the ruling class but a power different from the power of the ruling class, then the hostility between the two groups will disappear. In a given age, the existence of revolutionary ideology must be preceded by the existence of the revolutionary class. The necessary conditions for this revolutionary class have been mentioned before.

However, in the observation of historical movements, when people separate the ideology of the ruling class from the ruling class itself, and put such ideology on an independent basis, when people do not attach importance to the conditions governing the production of such ideology and the producers, and when they belittle the foundations of these ideologies - individuals and historical environments - we may then say that in the age of

the rule of the aristocracy, there was a time when such ideas as chastity and loyalty held the ruling position, and in the age of the rule of the bourgeoisie, there was a time when the ideas of freedom and equality held the ruling position. Generally speaking, the ruling class gave itself such illusions.

All historians - principally those from the beginning of the 18th century - hold historical conceptions which must lead them to the realization that more and more abstract ideas, that is to say, more and more ideas expressed in generalities, were beginning to hold the ruling position. The question lies in this: any new class that replaces the previous ruling class must, in order to reach its own goal, describe its own interests as the common interests of all members of society. To put it in an abstract manner, it must impose on its own interests a universal cloak, presenting them as the ideas which are solely rational and acceptable to all.

The class carrying out the revolution (referring solely to its antithesis to another class) from the very beginning does not emerge as a class, but as the representative of the entire society. It assumes the role of the representative of the whole society in opposition to the ruling class.⁽¹⁾ This is because at the beginning its own interests are more or less related to the common interests of all other classes who do not hold a place in the ruling group, and because its own interests,

under the oppression of the relationship existing then, had not yet been developed into the special interests of a special class.

For this reason, the victory of such a class is also beneficial to many people of other classes which had not acquired ruling rights. However, at the most, such people could only be raised to the status of joining the ranks of the ruling class. When the French bourgeoisie overthrew the rule of the aristocracy, before many members of the proletariat there rose the possibility of their being raised to the level above that of the proletariat, but at the most they could only be transformed into the bourgeoisie.

It can thus be seen that the foundation which a new class can utilize for the building of its own rule is broader than the foundation of the previous ruling class. However, the antithesis between the classes not gaining access to the ruling position and the class that gains access to the ruling position will grow more acute and deeper as time goes on. These two situations lead to the following result: the classes which do not gain access to the ruling position will wage a struggle against the class that newly gains access to the ruling position more resolute compared with the struggles waged in the past for the ruling position, and opposition will be more thorough against the previous social systems.

As soon as the class rule is no longer a form of the

social system, and as soon as there is no longer the need to pass off special interests as universal interests, or pass off universal interests as the interests of the ruling class, there will naturally no longer exist the entire superfluity of passing off the rule of a specific class as the rule of a certain kind of ideology.

(Extracts from Marx and Engels: "German Ideology",
from "Marx and Engels on Art", pp 162-165.)

... As to the departments of thought which rise high to the skies, such as religion and philosophy, they all have their pre-historical contents which are discovered during a specified historical period, contents which we may now consider preposterous. All the false ideas concerning the world of nature, the true character of man, the soul, and magic power mostly possess an economic foundation of a negative nature. The low stage of economic development in the pre-historical era needed false ideas on the world of nature to supplement its deficiencies, or even resorted to such false ideas as conditions for development or reasons for its existence.

Although economic needs had been, and became more and more the major causes for the development of knowledge on nature, it will be foolish indeed to seek economic justifications for all the preposterous primeval views. Scientific history elimin-

ates the preposterous views, or changes them into new views, making history less infested with preposterous views. People engaged in this task belong to a special department in the division of labor, and they consider themselves as dealing with an independent department. So long as they become an independent group within the division of labor in society, their products, including the mistakes, must in turn affect the development of the entire society, and even economic development. But be this as it may, they themselves are still under the control and influence of economic development. In philosophy, for example, this situation can be more easily proved for the bourgeois period.

Hobbes⁽²⁾ was the first modern materialist (speaking for the 18th century), but at the time the whole of Europe was in the peak of monarchical despotism, and England was beginning to see a struggle between this despotism and the people, and he was a supporter of the despotic system. Locke,⁽³⁾ in religion as in politics, was a production of class compromise in 1688. The British proponents of deism and their more thorough successors the French materialists were one hundred per cent bourgeois philosophers. The French materialists were even philosophers of the bourgeois revolution. In German philosophy from Kant to Hegel, the vulgar face of the German bourgeoisie was sometimes expressed in a positive role and sometimes in a negative role.

However, the philosophy of each age, as a special division of labor, has for its pre-requisite certain specific ideological materials given it by its forerunners, and with which it makes a start. This has led to the phenomenon that an economically backward country may still be a forerunner in philosophy. In the 18th century this was true in the case of France in relation to Britain (though British philosophy had been used as a basis by the French.) Later this was also true for Germany in relation to Britain and France.

However, both in France and in Germany, the universal prosperity in philosophy and literature of the age was the result of economic advance. Economic development in the end did exert a controlling influence over the other departments. Of this I have no doubt. But such control occurs only within the scope of the specific conditions affecting the department concerned. In philosophy, for example, such controlling influence occurs only within the scope of the specific conditions of the role played by economic influences over the philosophical materials supplied by the forerunners (and these economic influences can only play their role under the cloak of politics or other factors). Here economy does not newly create anything, but it decides the change and further development of existing ideological materials. Even this small role is generally indirect. What exerts great and direct influence over philosophy is its

political, legal and moral reflection.

(Extracts from Engels: "To K. Smith", See Selected Works of Marx and Engels, vol. II, p. 495.)

Mr. Proudhon has further failed to understand that since people have produced social relationship in accordance with their material production, at the same time they have also produce various ideas and categories, that is to say, the abstract and ideological expressions of such social relationships. Thus, like the social relationships they represent, categories are also non-permanent. They are historical and transitory products. To Mr. Proudhon, the situation is entirely the opposite: abstraction and category are the primary causes. According to his view, history is created by abstractness and category, and not by men. In themselves, abstractness and category are separated from the people and their material activities, and are immortal, immutable and fixed. It is the product of pure reason. In a word, this is to say that abstractness is in itself abstract. What a beautiful specimen of redundancy.

(Extracts from Marx: "To P. V. Aninov, see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 449.)

A system of thought is the process created by the so-called thinkers. Though it is created consciously, the consciousness is false. The real motive power that pushes the thinker forward is for ever a mystery to him, for otherwise it would not

have been the process of thought. It can thus be seen that a thinker has given himself the idea of a false or superficial motive power. Since it is a process of thought, both its content and its form must have been procured from pure thinking - either his own thinking, or the thinking of teachers before him. He just plays with the materials for thinking, and naively holds that such materials have come from thinking. He does not study other things, sources more distant and not related to thinking. Such an approach to things is for him natural, for to him, since the actions of any person are carried out through thinking, then such actions seem ultimate to rest on thinking as the foundation.

Historical thinkers (the term history here is only a concept like politics, law, philosophy and theology - in a word, it not only relates to the world of nature, but also related to all social realms, a collective terminology) in any scientific department possess specific materials. These materials have been independently evolved by the thinking of people of past ages, and they have been further independently developed in the minds of the later ages. Of course, facts outside this or that realm, as contributory causes, can also influence the development, but such facts, according to our understanding, are also the fruits of the thinking process. So from beginning to end we continue to remain within the category of thinking, and this thinking seems capable of assimilating even the most stubborn facts.

It is precisely the form of the state machinery, the system of legal authority, this outward manifestation of the independent history of thinking in any realm, that first confused the majority of the people. If we say that Luther ⁽⁴⁾ and Calvin ⁽⁵⁾ "overwhelmed" official Catholicism, and that Hegel "overwhelmed" Kant and Fichte, ⁽⁶⁾ if we say that Rousseau with his republican Social Contract indirectly "overwhelmed" the constitutionalist Montesquieu, we shall still remain within the limits of theological, philosophical and political theory, registering a stage of development in thinking in these realms, a process which does not go beyond the category of thinking.

This was followed by the emergence of the bourgeois illusions of the permanency and absolute perfection of capitalist production. Even the "overwhelming" of the mercantilists by the agriculturists and Adam Smith ⁽⁷⁾ was also considered a purely ideological victory, not the reflection in thinking of the changed economic facts, but the ultimate attainment of real understanding of the permanently and universally existing facts. It can be seen that had Richard the Lion Hearted ⁽⁸⁾ and Philip Augustus ⁽⁹⁾ practiced free trade, and did not involve themselves in the Crusades, then the hunger, poverty and ignorance of five centuries would have been avoided.

(Extracts from Engels: "To Mehring," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, pp. 488-489.)

Tradition is a great obstacle, an obstruction force in history. It is however only a passive force and must be wiped out. Religion likewise cannot for ever serve as a pillar of capitalist society. If our legal, philosophical and religious ideas are all the near and distant branches of the economic relationships which at the moment occupy the ruling position in society, then these ideas cannot remain for ever after the economic relationships have been basically changed. Either we believe in super-natural miracles, or we must admit that the theology of any religion cannot save a dying society.

(Extracts from Engels: "The Ideal of Socialism Develops into a Science," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 115.)

II. We Must Break Down Old Tradition Thoroughly If We Are to Establish New Tradition

People create their own history, but such creative work is not carried out according to their own wishes, not under conditions they lay down for themselves. They do so under conditions already directly existent, already in their hands, and inherited from the past. All the traditions of the dead ancestors, like evil dreams, envelop the minds of the people. Just as when the people seem to be remolding the things around them, and creating things they did not have

before, just at a time of such a revolutionary crisis, they weak-mindedly resort to magical powers, seek help from the dead souls of the past, use their names, combat slogans and clothes, so that donning such ancient and funny clothes, speaking in such borrowed tongues, they present a new act in world history.

For example, Luther donned the clothes of the apostle Paul; and the revolution of 1789 to 1814, donned successively the clothes of the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire; and the revolution of 1843 only resorted to reluctantly don the clothes of the revolutionary traditions of 1789 and that of 1793 to 1795. It is just like a student who has just learned a foreign language, who always inwardly translates the foreign language into his native language. Only when he can translate a foreign language into his own without effort, and can dispense with thinking in his own tongue when using the foreign language may he be considered to have assimilated the spirit of the new language, to have mastered the use of the new language.

Nevertheless, however lacking may bourgeois society be in the heroic spirit, its birth had called for courageous acts, self sacrifices, terrorist methods, civil wars and national wars. In the solemn model tradition of the Roman Republic, the fighters of bourgeois society found their needed ideal, art form, and illusion, so that they may not themselves see

the narrow content of the bourgeoisie for which they are fighting, and so that they may preserve their zeal at the high level of a great historical tragedy.

For example, one century ago, at another stage of development, Cromwell and the British people, in the interests of their own bourgeois revolution, had made use of the words, zeal and illusion of the "Old Testament." When the real goal was gained, when the reform of the bourgeoisie of British society was realized, Locke replaced the Prophet "A-wa-ku."

It can thus be seen that in these revolutions, the dead were resurrected in order to praise the new struggles, and not to reluctantly copy the old struggles. They were to raise to a higher level the imagined significance of a certain cause, and not to avoid the solution of this cause in realities. They were to seek anew the spirit of the revolution, and not to let the dead souls of the revolution to move about again.

.....

The social revolution of the 19th century could not obtain its inspiration from the past, but only from the future. It could not be started before it basically broke down the superstitious worship of old things. The revolutions of the past needed some past things as the reminiscences of world history, in order to cover up their own contents before themselves. The revolutions of the 19th century must let the dead bury them-

ves, so that they may clarify their own contents. In the past phrasology was more important than content, today content is more important than phrasology.

(Extracts from Marx: "The Coup of Louis Bonaparte," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, p. 223.)

I express felicitations for scientific prosperity. The people of this science understand the original traditional strength and significance of science, and are adept in the utilization of this tradition in the interests of science, but will not follow tradition blindly. This is known to all. I wish to speak on such a scientific strong man, who is also the greatest personality of the modern age. I refer to our teacher, our fosterer Lenin. . .

(Extracts from Stalin: "Speech at the Kremlin reception for workers in higher educational institutions," See "Stalin on Literature and Art", pp 46-47.)

The May 4 Movement promoted a cultural revolution which was a movement thoroughly opposed to feudal culture. Since the dawn of Chinese history, there had never been such a great and thorough cultural revolution. At the time it made great achievements with its two great banners of the cultural revolution: opposition to old ethics and promotion of new ethics.

and opposition to old literature and promotion of new literature.

(Extracts from Mao Tse-tung: "On New Democracy", see
Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. II, p. 671.)

III. We Must Critically Inherit, and Oppose Blind Worship

Feuerbach broke down the philosophical system of Hegel, and simply abandoned it. But the announcement that this philosophy is erroneous is still not the defeat of the philosophy. One simply cannot dispose of such a colossal product like the philosophy of Hegel, which had produced far reaching influence on the national spirit, like Hegel's philosophy, by simply disregarding it. We must "abandon" it on its own significance, that is to say, we must use the critical method to eliminate its form, and salvage the new content to be gained from it.

(Extracts from Engels: "On Feuerbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 365.)

Precisely because of this industrial revolution, man's labor productivity has reached such a height. In human history for the first time there is the possibility, under the condition of rational division of labor for all, not only to produce sufficient goods to satisfy the colossal consumption needs of all members of society, but also to accumulate rich reserves,

and furthermore to enable everybody to have sufficient leisure to take over all the really valuable things from the culture (science, art, public living forms and so forth) left over from history. And the people not only take it over, but also convert all these things formerly monopolized by the ruling class into the public property of society, to promote their further development. The key is found here.

(Extracts from Engels: "On the Problem of Residence," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.I, p. 543-544.)

We must begin anew the study of our entire history. First we must carefully study the conditions for the existence of various social states, and from these conditions seek out the corresponding viewpoints on politics, private law, art, philosophy, and religion. In this field, up to now very little has been produced, because there are still few people earnestly engaged in this work. Here we need great help. This realm is very extensive. Whoever is prepared to work earnestly will succeed in many creations and make outstanding achievements. However, many Germans of the younger generation do not do so. They only use the watchword of historical materialism (all things can be turned into watchwords) to build into a system their rather poor historical knowledge (it must be noted that

economic history is still in its cradle) and then self complacently enjoy their own work.

(Extracts from Engels: "To K. Smith," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.II, p. 487.)

The history of philosophy and the history of social science have very clearly shown that in Marxism there is absolutely nothing similar to "sectarianism." It definitely cannot be a narrow and stubborn doctrine that is separated from the great road of development of world civilization. Quite to the contrary, the entire genius of Marx lies in his replies to the various problems which have been brought forward by the advanced thinking of humanity. The birth of his doctrine is the direct succession to the greatest doctrines in philosophy, political economy and socialism.

The doctrine of Marx is all embracing because it is correct. It is very perfect and complete. It gives people a complete world outlook that will definitely not compromise with the defenses for any superstition, any reactionary force, and any bourgeois oppression. The doctrine of Marx is the excellent fruit created by humanity in the 19th century, the natural successor to Germany's philosophy, Britain's political economy, and France's socialism.

(Extracts from Lenin: "The Three Sources and Three Constituent Parts of Marxism", see Complete Works

of Lenin, Vol. XIX, pp 1-2.)

Marxism, this revolutionary proletarian system of thought, has won world-wide historical significance. This is because it has not abandoned the most valuable achievements of the age of the bourgeoisie, but to the contrary, it has absorbed and remolded all the valuable things in human thinking and cultural development of more than 2,000 years. Only on such a foundation, according to such a direction, and continuing work under the stimulus of the practical experiences of the proletarian dictatorship (this is the final struggle of the proletariat in opposition to all exploitation), may we develop a real proletarian culture.

(Extracts from Lenin: "On Proletarian Culture," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXXI, p. 283.)

If you should ask how the doctrine of Marx should have such a hold over the hearts of millions upon millions of the most revolutionary class, you can only have one answer. It is because Marx has placed reliance on the firm foundation of the knowledge which humanity has achieved under the capitalist system; Marx has studied the law of the development of human society; he has realized that the development of capitalism must lead to Communism, and more important, he has proved this conclusion on the basis of the most careful and most pene-

treating study of capitalist society, with help from his complete knowledge provided by science in the past. He has used the critical attitude in the examination of all things created by human society, and neglected not a single point. He has reviewed anew everything established by human thinking, criticized everything, and inspected everything on the basis of the practice of the workers movement. And thus he has arrived at the conclusion which had been restricted by the narrow character of the bourgeoisie or restrained by the prejudice of the bourgeoisie so that people could not notice it before.

For example, when we discuss proletarian culture, we must pay attention to the following point. We must clearly recognize that only by correctly understanding the culture created by the entire course of the development of humanity, and by remolding this culture, may we build up the proletarian culture. Without such a recognition, we shall not fulfill the task. Proletarian culture does not drop from heaven, and it cannot be fabricated by the so-called self-styled proletarian cultural experts. Such is entirely non-sense. Proletarian culture should be the natural result of the development of the entire knowledge created by mankind under the oppression of capitalist society, landlord society and bureaucratic society. All these channels large and small, in the past, at present and in the future, must all lead to proletarian culture. This is just as the political economy

remolded by Marx points out to us the natural outcome of human society, and points out the transition to class struggle, and the transition to the beginning of the proletarian revolution.

.....

You should not only understand the knowledge you have learned, but also use a critical attitude in mastering such knowledge so that your minds may not be filled with a heap of useless garbage, but is equipped with all the practical knowledge that a modern learned person should possess. If a Communist does not exert the most earnest, the most assiduous and heavy effort, if he does not understand his need to use the critical attitude in dealing with things, but desires to make a show of the prepared conclusions in Communism which he has learned, he is then a pitiable Communist. Such an attitude of not caring to understand things is most harmful.

Extract from Lenin: "The Tasks of the Young Communist League," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol.III, pp 253-255.)

Tolstoy has died, and the pre-revolution Russia has also become the past. Its weakness and effeminacy have been expressed in the philosophy and depicted in the works of this genius of an artist. But his legacy contains things which belong not to the past, but to the future. The Russian proletariat must accept this legacy, and study this legacy. The Russian prole-

tariat must explain before the laboring masses and the exploited masses the significance of Tolstoy's criticism of the state, the church, and private land ownership. But the goal is not to make the masses to limit themselves to lingering after his self discipline and pure living, but rather rouse them into new attacks on the czarist monarchical government and the land ownership system of the landlords. This monarchical government and private ownership system received only slight injuries in 1905, and they must be totally eliminated. The Russian proletariat must explain before the masses Tolstoy's criticism of capitalism. But the goal is not limited to the cursing of the powers of capital and money, but rather to enable them to learn, in their living and struggle to rely everywhere on the technical achievements and social achievements of capitalism, and to unite themselves into a large army of a million socialist fighters, to overthrow capitalism, and to create a new society in which the people are no longer poor and there is no exploitation of man by man.

(Extracts from Lenin: "L. N. Tolstoy," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol.XVI, pp.325-326.)

The doctrine of Tolstoy reflects down to its rock bottom the great ocean of the people that is so stormy. It reflects all the weaknesses and also all its strength.

By studying the works of art of Tolstoy, the working

class of Russia will more clearly recognize its enemy. If all the Russian people of Russia will analyze Tolstoy's doctrine, they will realize where their weak points lie, weak points which prevent them from carrying out to the end their own liberation. In order to progress, they must realize this.

All the people who declare Tolstoy to be "the conscience of the public," and "the teacher of life" are obstructing the advance of the movement. These are lies intentionally spread by the liberals who wish to exploit the counter revolutionary side of Tolstoy's doctrine. Certain former members of the Social Democratic Party also follow the liberals in repeating this lie, calling Tolstoy the "teacher of life."

The Russian people must no learn from Tolstoy how to achieve a beautiful life. They should study from the class whose significance Tolstoy had not understood, the one class that can destroy the old world which Tolstoy hated. that is, the proletariat. Only when the Russian people understand this will they achieve liberation.

(Extracts from Lenin: "Tolstoy and the Proletarian Struggle," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XVI, p. 352.)

As a matter of fact, artistic and literary works of the past are not the source but the flow; they are the products which the ancients and the foreigners created out of the art-

istic and literary raw material they lit upon in the people's life of their own times and places. We must take over all the fine artistic and literary legacy, critically assimilate from it whatever is beneficial to us and hold it up as an example when we try to work over the artistic and literary raw material derived from the people's life of our own time and place. It makes an enormous difference whether or not one has such examples to look up to, a difference which explains why some works are refined and others crude, some polished and others coarse, some superior and others inferior, some smoothly done and others laboriously executed. Therefore we must not refuse to take over the legacy from the ancients and the foreigners and learn from such examples, whether feudal or bourgeois. But succession to a legacy and learning from examples should never take the place of the creation of our own work, for nothing can take its place. In art and literature, the uncritical appropriation and imitation of the ancients and foreigners represent the most sterile and harmful artistic and literary doctrinairisms.

(Extracts from Mao Tse-tung: "Address to the Literary Forum at Yen-an," see Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol.III, p. 682.)

We should take over the rich legacy and succeed to the fine tradition of Chinese and foreign art and literature of the Past, but we must do this with our eyes upon the broad masses

of the people. We do not refuse to make use of the artistic and literary forms of the past, but in our hands these old forms, remolded and filled with new content, also become things which are revolutionary and serve the people.

(Extracts from Mao Tse-tung: "Address to the Literary Forum at Yen-an," see Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. III, p. 877.)

It is wrong to adopt a policy of excluding foreign culture and we must fully absorb progressive foreign culture as an aid to the development of China's new culture; but it is also wrong to import indiscriminately foreign culture into China, for we must proceed from the actual needs of the Chinese people and assimilate it critically.

(Extracts from Mao Tse-tung: "On Coalition Government," see Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. III, p. 1107.)

China should absorb on a large scale the progressive cultures of foreign countries as an ingredient for her own culture; in the past we did not do enough work of this kind. We must absorb whatever we today find useful, not only from the present socialist or new democratic cultures of other nations, but also from the older cultures of foreign countries, such as those of the various capitalist countries, in the age of enlightenment. However, we must treat these foreign materials as we do our food

which should be chewed in the mouth, submitted to the working of the stomach, and intestines, mixed with saliva, gastric juice and intestinal secretions, and then separated into essence to be absorbed and waste matter to be discarded - only thus can food benefit our body; we should never swallow anything raw or absorb it uncritically. So-called "wholesale westernization" is a mistaken viewpoint. China has suffered a great deal from the formalist absorption of foreign things.

.....

A splendid ancient culture was created during the long period of China's feudal society. To clarify the process of development of this ancient culture, to throw away its feudal dross and to absorb its democratic essence is a necessary condition for the development of our new national culture and for the increase of our national self confidence; but we should never absorb anything and everything uncritically. We must separate all the rotten things of the ancient feudal ruling class from the fine ancient popular culture that is more or less democratic and revolutionary in character. As China's present new politics and new economy have developed out of her old politics and old economy, and China's new culture has also developed out of her old culture, we must respect our own history and should not cut ourselves adrift from it. However, this respect for history means only giving history a definite place among the sciences,

respecting its dialectical development, but not eulogizing the ancient while disparaging the modern, or praising the noxious feudal element. As to the masses of the people and the young students, the essential thing is to direct them not to look backward, but to look forward.

(Extracts from Mao Tse-tung: "On New Democracy," see
Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. II, pp. 678-679.)

Another task in our study is to study our historical legacy and sum it up critically from the Marxist approach. Our nation has a history of several thousand years, a history which has its own characteristics and is full of treasures. But in these matters we are mere schoolboys. The China of today has developed from the China in history; as we are believers in the Marxist approach to history, we must not cut off our whole historical past. We must make a summing up from Confucius to Sun Yat-sen and inherit this precious legacy. This will help much in directing the great movement of today.

(Extracts from Mao Tse-tung: "The Position of the
Chinese Communist Party in the National War," see
Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. III, pp. 352-353)

During the May 4 Movement, modern minded people opposed the classical diction in favor of the vernacular, and the traditional dogmas in favor of science and democracy; in all this

they were quite right. At that time, the movement was lively, progressive and revolutionary. The ruling class of that time indoctrinated students with Confucian teachings and compelled the people to believe reverently in the whole Confucian caboodle as if it were religious dogma, and all writers wrote in the classical style. In short, at that the things written and taught by the ruling class and its toadies were in the nature of the "eight-legged essay" and dogma, whether in form or in content. These were the old "eight-legged essay" and old dogma.

On exposing to the people the ugliness of the old "eight-legged essay" and dogma and calling on them to oppose both, the May 4 Movement made a great achievement. Another of its great achievements which is linked to this is opposition to imperialism, but the struggle against the old "eight legged essay" and dogma remains one of its great achievements. Later on, however, the foreign "eight-legged essay" and foreign dogma came into being. Having departed from Marxism, certain people in our Party developed the foreign "eight-legged essay" and foreign dogma into subjectivism, sectarianism and the Party "eight-legged essay." These are the new "eight legged essay" and new dogma.

They are so deeply ingrained in the minds of many comrades that even today it calls for great efforts on our part to carry out the work of reform. Thus we see that the lively, progressive and revolutionary May 4 Movement which fought against the

old feudal "eight-legged essay" and dogma was later turned by some people into its very opposite, and the new "eight-legged essay" and dogma emerged. These things are not lively but dead and stiff, not progressive but retrogressive, and not revolutionary but an obstacle to the revolution. That is to say, the foreign "eight-legged essay" or the Party "eight-legged essay" is a reaction to the very nature of the May 4 Movement.

The May 4 Movement, however, had its own weaknesses. Many of the leaders of that time still lacked the critical spirit of Marxism and the method they used was generally that of the bourgeoisie, i.e., the formalistic method. They were quite right in opposing the old "eight-legged essay" and dogma and in advocating science and democracy. But with regard to existing conditions of that time, to history and to things foreign, they lacked the critical spirit of historical materialism and regarded what was called bad as absolutely bad and what was called good as absolutely, totally good. This formalist approach to problems affected the subsequent development of the movement.

(Extracts from Mao Tse-tung: "Opposing the Party Eight-Legged Essay", see Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. III, pp. 352-353.)

IV. In Treating the Cultural Legacy, We Must
Adopt the Method of Class Analysis and

a Critical Attitude

Here we naturally cannot discuss in detail matters relating to Goethe himself. We only wish to draw attention to one point. In his own works, Goethe held a dual attitude toward the Germany society of the day. Sometimes he was hostile toward it. For example, in "Iphigenia," and during the whole period of his travels in Italy, he hated the German society and sought to escape from it. He opposed them as Prometheus and Faust did and heaped on it the piercing scorn of Mephistopheles. Sometimes it was the opposite. For example, in most of the poems in the collection "Westostlicher Diwan" and in many of his prose writings, he hung close to German society, "acomodated" it. In "Masquerade Tour" he praised it. Particularly in his works touching on the French Revolution, he even protected it and helped it to resist the historical waves that assailed it from the outside.

The question is not that Goethe should have accepted certain phases of German life and opposed the phases to which he was hostile. Such was often the reflection of his different modes of feeling. Deep in his heart was the struggle between the genius and poet on the one side, and the correct son of the municipal councillor of Frankfurt-on-Main and the respected counselor of the Duke of Weimar on the other side. The former hated the vulgar environment around him; and the latter had to

compromise with such an environment and give the latter accommodations.

For this reason, Goethe was at times very great, and at other times very insignificant. Sometimes he was a rebel, a genius who was scorned at and who in turn looked down on the world. At other times he was careful and particular, being satisfied with everything, and a narrow-minded vulgar person. Even Goethe could not defeat Germany's vulgarity. To the contrary, this vulgarity defeated him. The fact that this vulgarity defeated Germany's greatest personage fully proves that it is basically impossible to defeat vulgarity "from the inside."

Goethe was too learned, his nature was too animated, and he was too full of flesh and blood. So he could not act like Schiller who rid himself of vulgarity by finding escape in the ideal of Kant. He was too sensitive and could not but realize that an escape would ultimately be the use of an exaggerated vulgarity to replace ordinary vulgarity. His character, his energy and his entire spirit pushed him toward realistic life, but the realism he came into contact with was rather deplorable. He should have held in contempt his living environment, but he was from beginning to end imprisoned within the sole environment within which he could move.

Goethe was always in such a dilemma. As he approached old age, this great poet all the more became *de guerre lasse*, and

yielded all the more to the Duke of Weimar. We do not follow "Pai-erh-ni" and Manger in condemning Goethe as not being a liberal, we only find fault with him for being at times a vulgar person. We do not condemn him for the lack of enthusiasm in winning freedom for Germany, but only find fault with him for sacrificing the more correct sense of beauty which at times emerged from his inner heart, because of his fears for the vulgar people who were produced by all the great historical torments of the day. We do not condemn him for having served under the duchy, but only find fault with him because at a time when Napoleon was sweeping clean the Germany which was then a great cattle fold of Archæus, he could so seriously perform on behalf of such an insignificant duchy meaningless tasks and seek menus plaisirs. We do not condemn him with moral, and sectarian viewpoints, but only take him to task from the viewpoints of aesthetics and history. We do not measure him with moral, political, or "human" standards. Here we cannot take up his entire age. His literary seniors and contemporaries in our description of him. We also cannot describe him from his personal advance in combination with his social status. So we are content here with the recording of the facts.

(Extracts from Engels: "German Society in Poetry and Prose," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, pp. 256-257.)

In the works, viewpoints, theories and academic sections of Tolstoy, the contradictions are truly marked. On the one hand, we have the genius of an artist who has not only created incomparable pictures of Russian life, but also created products of the first level in world literature. On the other hand we have a landlord who is a fanatical believer in Christ. On the one hand, he very effectively, directly, and sincerely opposed the lies and hypocrisy of society. On the other hand he was a "Tolstoyian," that is, a depraved and hysterical poor creature, a so-called Russian intellectual who would openly thump his chest and say, "I am base, I am lowly, but I am carrying out moral self cultivation. I eat meat no more, I only eat rice and flour now."

On the one hand he mercilessly criticized capitalist exploitation, exposed the oppression of the government and the farce of the courts and the administrative organs of the state, exposed the accumulation of wealth, the achievements of civilization and the poverty of the masses of workers and the aggravation of barbarism and suffering. On the other hand he madly advocated "the non-use of brutal force in the resistance against brutality."

On the one hand, he practiced the most sane realism and tore down all masks. On the other hand, he madly advocated one of the most abhorable things in the world, religion, striving

to have monks with moral qualities to replace monks with official positions. That is to say, he was fostering a most ingenious but the specially evil brand of monasticism. We may truly say:

Oh! Mother of Russia,

You are poor and wealthy,

You are powerful and weak!

Placed in the midst of such contradictions, Tolstoy absolutely could not understand the workers movement, and the role of the workers movement in the struggle for socialism. And he absolutely could not understand the Russian revolution. This is obvious. But the contradictions in Tolstoy's viewpoints and theories were not accidental. They reflected the contradictions during the last three decades of the 19th century in the actual life of Russia. The rural areas under the clan system, only the day before liberated from serfdom, were plundered by capitalism and the state treasury. The old foundations of the peasant economy and the livelihood of the peasants, foundations which had actually been preserved for so many centuries, were being most rapidly destroyed.

The contradictions in the viewpoints of Tolstoy should not be evaluated from the angle of the modern workers movement and modern socialism (such evaluation is of course necessary but it is not sufficient). They should be evaluated from the angle of his opposition of the newly risen capitalism, opposition to

the loss by the masses of property and land (so long as there are clannish rural areas in Russia, there will be such opposition). As a prophet who invented the new road to salvation. Tolstoy was laughable. Very pitiable, therefore, are those people inside and outside this country who would be "Tolstoyists" who wanted to transform the dregs of his theories into a kind of religion.

Tolstoy was a great man as the revealer of the ideas and feelings of the millions upon millions of the peasants of Russia on the eve of the Russian bourgeois revolution. Tolstoy was rich in the creative spirit, for all his viewpoints, generally speaking, exactly revealed the characteristic of the revolution of our country as a revolution of the peasant bourgeoisie. Viewed from this angle, the contradictions in the viewpoints of Tolstoy truly served as a mirror that reflected the various contradictory situations in which the peasants were placed in the historical activities of our revolution.

On the one hand, the oppression under the serf system for hundreds of years, and the accelerated bankruptcy of the peasants in the few decades after reform had accumulated innumerable hatreds and the determination to fight a struggle to death. There was the demand for the thorough suppression of official operated churches, the overthrow of the landlords and their government, the elimination of all old land occupation forms and occupation systems, the restoration of land to the people,

the establishment of a social life of the small peasants with freedom and equality to replace the the police type class. This demand was like a red thread that permeates every step of the peasants in our revolution. There is no doubt that the ideological content of the works of Tolstoy, rather than being in conformity with the abstract "Christian anarchy" (this was sometimes referred to as the "system" of his viewpoints), was more in conformity with the aspirations of the peasants.

On the other hand, the peasants who sought a new form of social life used an unconscious, clannish, and religiously fanatical attitude in dealing with the following problems: the form of such a social life; the kind of struggle that would bring them freedom; the leaders they would get in the struggle; the attitude that would be adopted toward the interests of the peasants' revolution by the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intellectuals; and the reason for the need to overthrow the power of the czar in order to eliminate the system of land ownership by the landlords.

The entire life of the peasants in the past had taught them to hate the gentry and the officials, but had not taught them and could not teach them where to seek the answers to these various questions. In the revolution of our country, a small portion of the peasants really carried out the struggle, and they were more or less organized toward this end. A

very small portion of them had taken up arms to fight their enemy wiping out the servants of the czar and the shelterers of the landlords. The majority of the peasants, however, just wept, prayed, talked, and dreamed, wrote petitions and despatched representatives to lodge appeals. All this was fully in keeping with the spirit of L. N. Tolstoy.

Under such circumstances the following would happen: some one like Tolstoy, not interested in politics, not understanding politics, would lead only a small number of peasants to follow the awakened and revolutionary proletariat, while the majority of the peasants would be turned into unprincipled and submissive prisoners of the bourgeois intellectuals. These intellectuals who were called constitutional democrats left the meeting of the laborites and came over to the hall of the Stolypin party⁽¹²⁾ to lodge their appeals, and to bargain, talk peace and compromise. After they agreed to talk peace, they were finally kicked out with the boots of the soldiers. The ideology of Tolstoy is a mirror of the weakness and defect of the rising of our peasants, the reflection of the weakness of the clannish rural areas and the timidity of the peasants who were adept in working their land.

(Extracts from Lenin: "L. N. Tolstoy Is a Mirror of the Russian Revolution", see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XV, pp. 179-181.)

The doctrine of Tolstoy is illusionary, and its content is reactionary (here the term reactionary is used in its most correct and penetrating sense). But this is definitely not to lead us to the conclusion that this doctrine is not socialist, and that this doctrine does not contain critical components which can produce valuable material for the enlightenment of the advanced classes.

There are various kinds and brands of socialism. In all countries adopting the capitalist method of production, there is one kind of socialism which represents the ideological system of the class that is to replace the bourgeoisie; and there is another kind of socialism which is in keeping with the ideological systems of the classes replaced by the bourgeoisie. For example, feudal socialism belongs to the latter type of socialism. As early as more than 60 years ago, the nature of this kind of socialism had been evaluated by Marx in his evaluation of all other kinds of socialism.

Next, like many other schools of illusionary thought, the illusionary doctrine of Tolstoy possesses critical components. But we must not forget the deep directive of Marx: the significance of the critical components of illusionary socialism are exactly opposite to the progress of the development of history. As the social forces are more developed for the "arrangement" of new Russia and for the elimination of modern

social sufferings, and the nature of such activities is becoming more clarified, critical illusioary socialism will more rapidly "lose all its practical significance and all its theoretical basis."

Twenty-five years ago, though Tolstoyism possessed the characters of reaction and illusion, the critical components of the doctrine of Tolstoy nevertheless at times in practice could bring nenefits to certain strata of the residents. But in the course of the latest ten years, such a thing would have been impossible. This is because from the eighties of the last century till its end, there had been considerable advance in the development of history. As for us today, when the many events described above have been concluded and the "oriental" state of stagnation has come, when the self conscious reactionary ideas of the "sing-post group", the reactionary ideas of narrow class significance and selfish and self profiteering significance have been so extensive disseminated among the liberal bourgeoisie, when such ideas have even been disseminated among a portion of the so-called Marxists and given rise to the "liquidators", at such a time today, any attempt to idealize the doctrine of Tolstoy, to defend or to dampen his "non-resistance theory", his appeal to "the spirit", his call for "moral self cultivation," his teachings on "conscience" and "love," and his puritanism and his quetism, will produce the most direct and the

most serious damage.

(Extracts from Lenin: "Tolstoy and His Age," See Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XVII, pp. 35-36.)

On Tolstoy, I full agree with your view. The hypocrites and swindlers would make him a saint. Their non-sensical talk on and subservience to Tolstoy have enraged even Plekhanov. On this question we are at one.

I hold that we cannot pass lightly Tolstoy's passivism, anarchy, narodism and religious views.

(Extracts from Lenin: "Letter to Gorki", see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXXIV, p. 454.)

Herzen was one of these scions. ⁽¹³⁾ The December uprising of the Party members roused him, and "purified" him. In the forties of the 19th century in Russia where serfdom prevailed, he could reach the levels of the greatest thinkers. He understood Hegel's dialectics. He knew that dialectics is "the algebra of the revolution." He surpassed Hegel and followed Feuerbach to the road of materialism. In 1844 he wrote his first "correspondence on the study of nature" - "experience and idealism," - and it showed us that this thinker is even today a step higher than many modern natural scientists of the empiricist school, and a large group of idealists, philosophers and semi-idealists. Herzen had arrived at the

door of dialectical materialism, but he stopped short before historical materialism.

Precisely because Herzen had stopped thus, after the defeat of the revolution of 1848, he plunged into the state of spiritual bankruptcy. At the time Herzen had left Russia, and directly observed the revolution. At the time he was a democrat, revolutionary and socialist. However, his "socialism" was one of the many kinds of bourgeois and petty bourgeois socialism which flourished at the time of 1848, but had been thoroughly smashed by the June incident.⁽¹⁴⁾ Actually it was absolutely not socialism, but a kind of beautiful phrasology and good intention which the bourgeois democrats and the proletariat that had not yet been rid of their influence had used for the expression of their revolutionary nature at the time.

(Extracts from Lenin: "Commemorating Herzen," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XVIII, pp. 9-10.)

In the culture of every nation, there are certain democratic and socialist cultural components albeit they are not well developed. For each nation has its toiling masses and its exploited masses, and their living conditions must lead to the birth of democratic and socialist ideological systems. But in each nation there is also bourgeois culture (in most nations there is also the culture of the dark groups and the ecclesiastical sects). This is not only a component but also holds the

ruling position. Accordingly, "national culture" is generally the culture of the landlords, priests and the bourgeoisie.

.....

We want to say the following to members of socialist parties of all nations. In each modern nation, there are two nations. In each national culture, there are two national cultures. There is the Greater Russian culture of Purishkevich, Guchikov and Struve and the like, and there is also the Greater Russian culture of Tchaikovsky and Plekhanov. In Ukraine there are also two such cultures, just as there are two cultures in Germany, France, England and among the Jewish people.

If the majority of the Ukrainian workers come under the influence of the greater Russian culture, we may definitely know that apart from the culture and ideology of the priests and the bourgeoisie of greater Russia, the ideology of the democrats and social democrats of greater Russia also play a great role. In struggling against the first kind of "culture," the Marxists of Ukraine must separate from it the second kind of culture, and tell their own workers, "We must fully grasp, utilize and consolidate all opportunities for intercourse with the awakened workers of greater Russia, and their literature and ideas. This is the demand in the basic interests of the workers movement of Ukraine and the workers movement of greater Russia.

(Extracts from Lenin: "Critical Views on the National Question," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXV, pp. 5 & 15.)

- (1) Notes by Marx: "Universality includes: first, compatibility with the opposition classes; second, compatibility with competition and world intercourse; third, compatibility with the majority of the members of the ruling class; fourth, compatibility with the illusion of common interests; and sixth, compatibility with the self deception of thinkers and division of labor.
- (2) Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), British bourgeois materialist philosopher.
- (3) John Locke (1632-1704), British bourgeois materialist philosopher.
- (4) Martin Luther (1483-1586), German leader of religious reformation.
- (5) John Calvin (1509-1564), French leader of religious reformation.
- (6) Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814), a representative of German classical philosophy, subjective idealist.
- (7) Adam Smith (1723-1790), British bourgeois economist.
- (8) Richard the Lion Heart (1157-1199), King Richard I of England, led the Crusades.

- (9) Philip Augustus (1165-1223), King Philip II of France, led the Crusades.
- (10) The large and extremely dirty cattle fold of King Achaëus of Greek mythology. It implies a very dirty place.
- (11) The meaning is "small interests," referring to extraordinary expenditures on strange hobbies.
- (12) Stolypin (1802-1911), Russian Minister of the Interior, an extreme reactionary.
- (13) Scions of Russian aristocratic landlords.
- (14) The Paris proletarian uprising from 23 through 26 June 1848.

GORKY ON THE BOURGEOIS LITERARY HERITAGE

✓ The following is a full translation of an article entitled "Kao-erh-chi lun tau-ch'an chiai-chi wen-hsueh i-ch'an" (English version as above), appearing in Wen-i Pao (Literary Gazette), No.6, Peiping, 26 March 1960 pp.16-22)

(Wen-i Pao Editor's Comment) On the bourgeois literary heritage, particularly the class limitation of critical realistic literature of the 19th century, Gorky had made certain very good comments; and these views are filled with the critical spirit of Marxism.

Gorky held that "in the heritage of bourgeois culture, honey and poison are closely mixed up." This precisely describes the dual nature of the bourgeois literary heritage.

Revisionists and bourgeois intellectuals have made into "permanent truths" the bourgeois literature of the old age, particularly the bourgeois democracy and humanitarianism in the bourgeois literature of the 19th century. They have greatly publicized them, and created among the youths a kind of superstition to the effect that these things are not much different from the socialist and Communist spirit in proletarian literature. If we listen to

the views of Gorky, we can achieve the result of breaking down this superstition.

For this reason we have compiled the following materials for the reference of readers.

March 1960.

We have good reason to hope that, when the Marxists write the history of culture in the future, we shall fully believe that the role of the bourgeoisie in the process of the creation of culture had been greatly exaggerated. This is particularly so in the department of literature. It is equally true in the department of painting. Here the bourgeoisie is from beginning to end the employer, and so the legislator. The bourgeoisie never in the past, and does not at present incline toward the creation of culture - if we are to give a wider interpretation to such creation, and not confine ourselves to interpreting it as the continual development of physical living comfort and the development of luxurious living. Capitalist culture is nothing but the system of the methods with which the bourgeoisie materially and spiritually expand and consolidate its rule of the world, the people, underground wealth, and the forces of nature. The bourgeoisie has never interpreted the process of cultural development as a necessity for the development of the masses of all mankind. As we all know, the economic policy of the bourgeois-

sie has led to mutual hostility among the neighboring nationalities of a state. Those who are weakly organized, particularly the colored peoples, have become the slaves of the bourgeoisie, with less rights compared with the white slaves in the countries concerned.

(Extract from report on "The Literature of the Soviet Union," at the 1st Congress of Soviet Writers, on 17 August 1934.)

In the heritage of bourgeois culture, honey and poison are closely mixed together, and in bourgeois science, the "true statements" concerning past human history possess the character of an old wench well versed in world affairs disguised as a pure and simple young girl.

(Extract from "On Culture", published in 1935.)

"We do not deny heritage."⁽¹⁾ He had so stated 35 years ago. His whole life and work have proved that he actually never denied anything valuable in bourgeois culture. I feel that all the techniques and skills in the labor department and literary department are the most valuable things in bourgeois culture.

(Extract from: "On Honored Authors and Apprentice Writers," published in Izvestia, 1 May 1928.)

I wish to speak on realism in a simple way. In the 19th

century it was a major and most expensive and most beneficial literary school, and it was handed down to the 20th century. The characteristic of this school is its sharp rationalism and critical spirit. The creators of such realism were mostly people mentally superior to their contemporaries. Behind the brutal physical force of their class, they saw clearly the weakness of the social creativeness of the class. These people may be considered prodigals of the bourgeoisie. Just as the hero in the religious legend, they escaped from the restraint of their fathers, from the oppression of dogma and tradition. However, for the preservation of the honor of these rebels, we must state that a small number among them had returned to the fold of their class to enjoy their roast veal.

Because it holds a critical attitude toward realities, the literature of the "prodigals" of the bourgeoisie has very high value, though the authors of these short stories and novels did not point to a way out of the confusion created by the garrulous small citizens. Only a small number of authors, principally authors of the second grade, following the directives of current philosophies and authoritative criticisms, attempted to establish certain dogmatic truths, harmonizing the contradictions which could not be harmonized, to cover up the clear and despicable lies of the bourgeois social system.

The basic and central theme in 19th century literature

is individual pessimism brought about by the realization of one's weakness and effeminacy in society. Schopenhauer, Hartmann, (2) Leopardi, (3) Stirner (4) and many other philosophers all strengthened this idea with teachings of no significance whatever to human living. The source of such teachings naturally is to be found in their personal feeling of individual isolation and helplessness in society. In the new realities created by the proletariat in dictatorial Soviet Union, even a person hiding in the intense cold of the North Pole, always threatened with death, will not feel himself isolated and helpless.

.....

Bourgeois "prodigal" realism is critical realism. Critical realism exposes the ugliness of society, and describes people in the tradition of the home. "Life and adventure" under the oppression of religious dogma and law cannot point to a way out for the people. It is easy to criticize all things existent, but apart from affirming that social life and general "existence" are of no significance at all, it has failed to affirm anything else. Many people have already loudly asserted this point.

(Extract from: "The Study of Literature" of 1934,
in the article "Talking with Young Authors.")

We must understand that critical realism was produced

as the result of the individual creations of "superfluous people" who cannot struggle for their living, and cannot find their position in life, and more or less realizes the aimlessness of their individual existence which they interpret as the futility of all social life and the entire process of history.

We definitely do not deny the extensive and colossal work done by critical realism, and we attach great importance to its achievements in the literary forms and painting art. At the same time we must realize that we need this realism, if only for the purpose of explaining the remnants of the past, of struggling against such remnants, and exterminating them.

But such formal realism could not in the past, and cannot today foster the socialist character, because it only criticizes but does not affirm anything, or - which is worse - even affirms what it once had denied.

(Extract from report on "Soviet Literature," at the 1st Congress of All-Soviet Authors, 17 August 1934.)

Yes, many Manfreds⁽⁵⁾ have been molded, but each Manfred is merely using different language to tell the same truth: individual life is a mystery, man is solitary and uncomfortable on earth, sometimes even tragically solitary in the cosmos. Though such tragedy is moving, it is not very beautiful.

Manfred, the 19th century metamorphosis of Prometheus,

is a brilliant portrait of the small citizen individualist. Such a person only sees himself and the road to death before himself, and is oblivious of anything else in the world. Even at times he may talk of the suffering of the world, he would still not think of the efforts exerted by the world for the alleviation of the suffering. And even if he thinks of it, it would merely be for the purpose of showing that such suffering could not be overcome.

He feels that suffering cannot be overcome because his solitary and painful self is blind and cannot see the spontaneous activism of the collective body. He cannot think of victory. There is only one joy left for this "ego", and that is the airing of grievances, the chanting of one's own troubles, and the waging of a dying struggle against oneself. Since Manfred, the "ego" only delivers loudly the mourning verses for oneself, for the isolated and small creatures like oneself.

Such tunes have been given the name of "poems of pessimism". If we look into its meaning, we shall easily see that the "world" sung in the poem is only a kind of cover behind which hides the naked "self" that has forgotten its source. The "self" hides there, trembling for fear of death, wailing about the lack of meaning of individual existence, and this is sincere. The individual uses his own mind to judge the great world that is full of vitality, and he cannot but force on the entire

world his own feeling of the loss of the meaning of life. So he exaggerates his solitude, like a mosquito that starts to harass people the moment it feels bad, demanding that people should listen to the groans of his lonely soul.

Such a poem is sometimes effective, but it is merely the effectiveness of the sincere feeling of forlornness touching people. It may also be beautiful, but the beauty is that of the seductive glow of the leprosy, as depicted by Flaubert. It is entirely natural, just as when a man has exhausted the source of his courage and creativeness, and lost the feeling of organic connection with other people, he naturally reaches such a state of individual development.

(Extract from: "The Spirit of the
Individual Character.")

From ancient days the Russian philistine received an education which led him to distrust reason, or even to be hostile toward it. The Church is greatly concerned over this, and some literature has also helped in this. From the "Correspondence" of Gogol down to the present, among the very great writers of Russia, we cannot find many who took into account the creative force of reason and thence proceeded to understand that reason had made really colossal contributions to mankind. As early as in 1851, Tolstoy wrote in his "Diary"

"Consciousness is the greatest evil, and it can be said to be the greatest evil attainable by man." Later, in a letter to Yasnaya, he even said, "Too profound knowledge is abhorrible." This theory permeates his entire moral philosophy, and is even reflected in his great works.

Dostoyevsky was also hostile toward reason. With his genius he piercingly expressed a powerful force, the force of talent, apart from reason. To Andreyev, thinking is man's enemy, and he treated thinking as "a principle of feeling", as if it is a special kind of feeling. One of the most talented of modern writers has put into the mouth of his own "hero" the following words: "Thought - this is truly the source of suffering. Whoever can stamp out thinking will be commemorated by mankind."

Of course, an author is not responsible for the feelings, thinking and actions of his own "hero," if he does not act like Andreyev who forced his own feelings and thinking on his hero, but rather objectively describes the logical unavoidability of the development of such feelings and thinking, such as was done by "Ssu-t'ang-ta", Balzac and Flaubert. Here we are not talking about this author or that one, but rather an important fact: when the real and profound revolutionary ideology is organizing the will of a new class to accept the acts of reason and its labor and creations with the objective of

the reorganization of the entire culture on the foundation of collectivism, and the reorganization of the entire way of life, and by the side of this process there is clearly another view, a view hostile to reason.

Often in books we can feel a certain trend of the author, though written in respectful tone or even in tones sympathetic with the revolution, a trend which may be involuntary and not conscious, that seeks to lower the role of thinking, indicating the ineffectiveness of thinking in opposition to the "super-intellectual" or the "subconscious." If this is properly done, it is instructive and so beneficial. But it seems there is a kind of formula as a result of which such books are mostly badly written. In these books, because of the weak technique of the authors, there is more easily revealed the effects of philistinism. Here too philistinism creates "inside one's heart" poison gas, though not very serious, but nevertheless injurious, especially for youth.

(Extract from "Philistines," in the "Literary Vanguard Magazine", February/March 1929.)

Not all weeds are harmful or non-beneficial, because from many weeds we can extract some poison for curing disease. Philistinism only creates poison of a destructive nature. If the philistine does not feel that he is only an insignificant

small part in the machinery of capitalism, he would not have so stubbornly and futilely seek to prove his own importance, to prove his freedom of thought and will, to prove his existent rights, and he would not create in the 19th and 20th centuries such types of people as "superfluous person," "repentent aristocrats," "super-time heroes," and "those who are neither peacocks nor crows."

(Extract from report on "Soviet Literature" to
1st Congress of Soviet Writers, 17 August 1934.)

In the bourgeois literature of West Europe we must distinguish between two sects of authors. Those of the first sect eulogize and entertain their own class - T'e-lo-lo-fu, Wei-li-chi K'ao-k'o-li-ssu, Pu-li-sh-t'an, Ma-li-ya-t'e, Po-erh T'e-i-k'o-k'o, Po-erh Wei-hua-erh, Ou-k'o-ta-fu Fa-i-yeh, Weng-nan, Chiao-chih Sha-ma-lo-fu, Yu-li-ssu Shib-ting-so^(?) and hundreds of similar people. All of them are model "good people of property," and without much talent. But like their readers they also are equally artful and vulgar.

The second sect does not include many people, only a few dozen. They were the creators of critical realism and revolutionary romanticism. They were all rebels of their own class, "prodigals" of their own class, aristocrats destroyed by the bourgeoisie, or scions of the petty bourgeoisie who

had broken through the suffocating limits of their own class.

The works of this class of European writers have for us dual and indisputable value. First, they are model literary works in technique. Second, they are documents which show the process of the development and disintegration of the bourgeoisie, the creations of the rebels of this class and documents which critically explain its way of life and its traditional acts.

In my report I cannot analyze and criticize in detail the role of realism in 19th century literature. Its basic content may be summed up as opposition to the conservatism of the feudal lords as revived by the large bourgeoisie, the method of struggle being the organization of democracy on the foundation of the ideology of liberalism and humanitarianism, that is to say, petty bourgeois democracy. Many writers and the majority of their readers understood this kind of democracy to be in opposition to the large bourgeoisie on the one hand, and opposition on the other hand to the daily growing powers of attack built up by the proletariat against which preventive measures had to be taken.

(Extract from report on "Soviet Literature" to
1st Congress of Soviet Writers, 17 August 1934.)

The entire literature of the West and of Russia during the 19th century was in nature built from one pattern. The

major works were created by a single youth. He came from the bourgeoisie, the class which held the state power after the French Revolution. Because of certain reasons, this man could not live comfortably in the society of the victors. There he could not find position, perhaps because he overestimated himself. He held himself above others. He aroused in others undivided confidence in him, but his whole life was a minor tragedy. Practically the whole of the literature of the 19th century was built on this pattern.

(Extract from "Talk with Members of the Youth Shock Corps Who have Entered the Literary Circles" published in 1931.)

The basic theme of the literature of Europe and Russia in the 19th century was the individual opposed to society, the state and nature. The major reason which roused the individual into opposition to the bourgeois society was traceable to the innumerable negative impressions which had become organized in contradiction to class ideology and living traditions. The individual greatly felt the oppression of such impressions which stood in the way of his development, but failed to realize that he himself shared the responsibility for the vulgar, evil and criminal foundations for the bourgeois society.

Jonathan Swift was a satirist of all Europe, but the

bourgeoisie of Europe held that his satire was only directed against England. Generally speaking, when a rebel criticizes the life of his society, he seldom and not easily recognizes his own responsibility for the shameful realities of this society. Particularly when the basic motive of his criticism of the existing system comes less from his profound and correct understanding of the significance of the various factors of social economy, generally his criticism has been occasioned by his feeling of despair over the life in the narrow iron cage of capitalism, or else by the desire for revenge against his own failure in life and the shame it has brought him.

We may say that when an individual turns around toward the masses of workers, he does not do it in the interests of the masses, but rather hopes that the masses of workers, after they have destroyed capitalism, will guarantee him freedom of thought and freedom of action. Let me repeat, literature before the revolution was basically written on the theme of the tragedy of such people who felt their life very narrow, found themselves superfluous in society, sought a place of comfort in society, and failed to find it. So they suffered, died, or compromised with the society they hated, or sunk deeper and deeper to become drunkards, or suicides.

(Extract from "Soviet Literature", report to the
1st Congress of Soviet Writers, 17 August 1934.)

Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky were geniuses of the highest order. With their genius they shook the whole world and made all Europe pay attention to Russia with alarm. The two of them have joined the ranks of Shakespeare, Dante, Cervantes and Goethe, and take their places among them without qualm. But for a time they produced bad influence over their dark and unfortunate fatherland.

Such influence was produced at a time when our elite figures were tired and had fallen down in their struggle for the liberation of the people from oppressive rule, and the young forces preparing to take over were feeling uneasy and fearful in front of the ominous silence of the execution stand, enslavement, and the cryptically foolish people. In such a state, the young checked their advance and the people, like the earth beneath them, silently swallowed the blood which they had shed in the battle for freedom. The small citizens who had been overawed by the outbreak of the revolution, became tired in the hope for comfort and order, and they resolved to surrender to the victors, to betray the defeated, and for this betrayal they received some authority which, though small small, was for them nevertheless an attraction.

The heavy and gray clouds of darkness of the reactionary forces hovered above the state, and the star of hope was extinguished. Hesitation and depression suppressed the hearts

of the young people, and the blood stained hands of the dark forces once more rapidly weaved the net of slavery.

In this tragic moment, the spiritual leader of the society should speak out with his wise and righteous voice:

"The poverty and ignorance of the people are the sources of all the misfortunes of our life. They are the tragedy. In his tragedy, we should not be passive observers, for the situation sooner or later must force us to play the most important roles in this tragedy. When the people are still slaves and blind beasts, no one with intellect can afford to be calm, for the people will awaken, will achieve liberation, and will retaliate against those who had applied brutal force against them and despised them. When there are so many beggars around us, and so many slaves too, we cannot have good living. This state has strangled human nature in order to restore the beastliness of man, and to use this bestial force to consolidate their own state power. It opposes the intellect that forever is hostile toward brutal force. The welfare of a state lies in the freedom of the people, and only the forces of the people can defeat the dark forces of a state. Struggle for the victory of freedom and justice, for we will discover beauty in this victory. May your life be transformed into an epic. ..."

"Be patient!" So said Dostoyevsky in his address at the ceremony unveiling the memorial to Pushkin.

"Improve your own selves!" said Tolstoy, and he added:

"Do not use force to resist evil!"

In these exhortations for patience and non-resistance, there is something very ugly and shameful, something which is very much akin to malicious satire. We must understand that these two geniuses lived in a country where the brutal forces over the heads of the people had been developed to the alarming and extremely shameful stage. The ruling class rode roughshod, and the entire country was turned into a dark execution hall. The lackeys of the state power, from governors down to petty police officers, all barbarously plundered and manhandled millions upon millions of the people, playing with them as if they were mice caught in the trap.

And there were people who called on the suffering masses:

"Do not resist! Be patient!"

And they used beautiful language to eulogize the patience of the people. This painful example fully explains the real attitude of Russian literature toward the people. The entire literature of Russia is a stubborn preaching of the passive attitude toward life, the eulogy of passivism. This is natural.

The literature of the petty citizens cannot be otherwise, even if the small citizen artists possess genius.

(Extract from "Talk on the Habits of the Small Citizen,

Talk on Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky," This was first

published in the "New Life Journal" of 13 November 1905. Lenin had a high opinion of it.)

"Realism of the bourgeois aristocracy" is the critical realism of "Ssu-t'ang-ta", Balzac and Tolstoy. Because of this precisely, because of its use of the symbolic form to reveal a critical attitude, Lenin eulogized Tolstoy, and Engels and Marx eulogized Balzac. Our realism has the possibility and the right to define things. Its criticism is pointedly made on the past, and reflects the remnants of the past. Its major task is to use forms to describe facts, personalities and the mutual relationships of the people in the process of labor, and through this method to define socialism.

(Extract from "Letter to To-pin," 1933.)

Realism of bourgeois literature is critical, but this criticism is limited to application to the "strategy" of class, to explain the mistakes committed in the struggle of the bourgeois in the consolidation of its state power. It is limited to this need.

The aim of socialist realism is to struggle against the remnants of the "old world," to struggle against its corrupt influences, to uproot these influences. But the major task is to rouse the socialist and revolutionary world outlook.

(Extract from "Letter to Hsieh-erh-pa-k 'o-fu," 1935.)

Notes:

- (1) These are Lenin's words.
- (2) Hartmann (1842-1906), German reactionary idealist philosopher.
- (3) Leopardi (1798-1837), Italian poet.
- (4) Stirner (1806-1853), German reactionary idealist philosopher, advocated individualism and anarchy.
- (5) Manfred is the Hero of Byron's famous poem. He is a most solitary soul, deep in his fortresses, divorced from the world, to repent his past crimes. He is melancholy, feels sorry for heaven and the people, and has a high opinion of himself, and belittles all others. Finally he died in the fortress with his woe and indignation. He represents what is called "world sorrow" in European literature, a distorted mental state. In the literature of various European countries there are many figures similar to the pattern of Manfred.
- (6) Leonid Andreyev (1871-1919), writer of old Russia, one of the most representative of Russian symbolist playwrights.
- (7) All these are second rate authors of European Romantic Literature.
- (8) Referring to Czarist Russia.

REFUTING PA JEN'S MODEL THEORY OF
"THE BASIC NATURE OF MANKIND"

[The following is a full translation of an article entitled "Po pa-jen ti jen-lei pen-hsing ti tien-hsing lun" (English version as above), by Li Hsi-fan, in Wen-i Pao (Literary Gazette) No.7, Peiping, 11 April 1960, pp.35-43.]

On the eve of the anti-rightist struggle, when the wave of revisionism was rising both inside and outside China, Pa Jen also raised a banner, known as "sentimental literature." He has repeatedly publicized this viewpoint in his works, "The Real and Human World," "On Sentiment," "Letter Received," "Using This Note to Serve as an Article," and the first draft of his "Postscript to the Collection Tsun-ming Chi" as published in Jen-min Wen-hsueh (People's Literature) of July 1957.

As a matter of fact, long before this, in his "Articles on Literature", he had done a lot of publicity for his half-concealed "basic human nature." In this book, his views on the "basic nature of mankind" had already become a system of "theory." A careful analysis of that more than 500,000 word book, "Articles on Literature," is naturally not the task that can be shouldered by the present article. Here I only wish to speak on the question of model which Pa Jen also considers most important in literary creations.

I

In his "Articles on Literature," Pa Jen says, "The most important task in the creation of literature and art is the creation of a model form. The model form is the most important criterion for the evaluation of the ideological nature and the artistic nature of a work."

Because he paid such great attention to this question, perhaps, in the collection "Articles on Literature," he used 63 pages to instill into readers his views on the model. Furthermore, in his collection "Tsun-ming Chi", as soon as he found an opportunity, he would repeatedly publicize this view of his, which became more and more open. Later he no longer discussed the question of models in literature, and was using it to attack socialist literature.

What, then, is Pa Jen's model which is "the most important task in literary and artistic creation?" How is it created? Those who have read "Articles on Literature" may for a moment not see it clearly, because in his general description, Pa Jen has used a lot of coloring devices to shield it. For example, "In a class society, the people are divided into different classes and groups. Each person in the different classes and groups must share the common class characteristic and class nature of this class or group." Such phrases and sentences make up the introduction to his exposition of views opposite

in nature. As a self styled "Marxist," how can he achieve the end of confusing the youths without quoting some high-falutin phrases?

The question, however, does not lie in these pompous introductory passages. The question lies in the fact that as soon as it comes to the concrete analysis of concrete things, the real nature of "the basic nature of humanity" will immediately be revealed, and it vigorously revises and overthrows his originally confirmed premise. In "Articles on Literature", such examples are innumerable.

There is no need for us to examine in detail Pa Jen's treatment of the model in his "Articles on Literature," because in actual fact he has not made a penetrating investigation of this question, but has concentrated his efforts at criticism. However, from his so-called criticisms, we can still see what really constitute his views on the model he publicizes.

In his chapter on "The Question of Model in Literary Works," he concentrates his forces for the criticism of the formulae: "The model is the fullest and sharpest representation of the nature of the forces of a definite society," and "the model is the basic scope of the Party character represented in realistic art." These formulae are incorrect, and must be criticized because they confuse the differences between literature and art and the other ideological forms, and neglect the

fact that literature and art must reflect realistic life through their forms and individual character, and their need to realize the general in the individual. This has made literary and art workers to pay less attention to the creation of model characters with clear-cut individualistic traits.

Marxism holds that a model form must be the unified form that to a high degree embodies the class character and individual character of personalities. As Engels said, "Each person is a model, and at the same time is also a clear cut individual, just as Hegel's 'this one'." However, the criticism of this one-sided proposition absolutely does not imply that we can deny the common class character of the model. Quite to the contrary, "the concentration of ordinary phenomena, and making models of the struggles and contradictions therein" can make them "to reach a higher level, to become stronger, to be more concentrated, more exemplary, and more ideal compared with the ordinary realities in life, so that they will be more universal in character." This is the question of the generalization of the "common character" of model forms. This has always held the center of the attention of all greater writers.

Any model form must be "the model character in a model environment," and this is inseparably connected with the special characteristic of the class or group in its society. In the history of world literature, any great model figure must

first receive its artistic life from its clear cut class character. But according to Pa Jen, this is not the major question in the creation of the model. He says that the theory of the representation of the common class character in literature and art "is not in keeping with the entire complexity of human life and the dialectics of living." According to him, the question of the common character of literary models has its importance in "the things inherent in artistic works which through all ages can stimulate the people of different social classes, that is, things which have the common characteristics of humanity in general."

Although to make a show, he cannot but make use of a few "class" terms, such as in the following passage: "In a class society, the things which are the common characteristics of mankind in general are often imprinted with the marks of class, or concealed under class characteristics." In this passage we can also see that "the common characteristics of mankind in general" remains consistently the primary content, and "imprints" and "concealment" are only superficial or transitional phenomena, and do not constitute the primary things in a model character.

But even these "class" terms used for decorative purposes are to Pa Jen excessive. So he goes forthright to expel these things from the common character of the model. He re-

places them with "the common character of mankind in general," He says, "When a concrete person exceeds the limits of his own class, he will grow into producing something lofty that is shared by the majority of mankind." Does not this mean that only by removing the class characteristics, and retaining those which are starkly "the common characteristics of mankind in general," may we create a great model, and rouse "the majority of mankind"?

We may say that in "Articles on Literature," Pa Jen is still cautious, and cannot but refer only ambiguously to this "common character of mankind." If we do so, then in his "On Sentiment," he has spoken more directly through his slander of socialist literature. He says, "Our current literary works lack sentimentality, that is to say, they lack the things which can draw common reaction from people. They lack the humanitarianism of the basic nature of mankind." This is clear enough. Of the figures created in literary works, whether or not they are models will principally be decided by their capacity to rouse "the common reaction of all the people" of different classes.

On the question of the creation of models, Pa Jen has secretly replaced the class character of a model by "the common nature of humanity. More than that, he has interpreted the individualization of literary models as "needing as foundation something which goes to all men." In "Thoughts on the Question of Models" (in the collection "Tsou-ming Chi") he refers to

"the individual and the special characteristic" and says, "Any class warrior who dedicates his life to the proletarian cause still has to seek love, to enjoy beautiful things, and to rejoice over life, to hate death, to cherish freedom, and to aspire to happiness. These individual hopes and aspirations are connected with the common aspirations and demands of mankind." "Merely to generalize the class characteristics of man, without provision for the special characteristics of individuals (and this individual specialty is realized through the common aspirations of mankind) will not lead to the creation of models."

Thus, in the logical order of Pa Jen, the common character and the individual character of a model, as set forth by himself, "dialectically enters each other." In a word, according to Pa Jen, only by revealing the so-called "common basic nature of mankind" may a model acquire "the things which can rouse the people of all different social classes through the ages."

II

What are the "demands, loves and hopes" which belong to the "common nature of mankind," the so-called "fragrance of flowers, the songs of birds, the enjoyment of food and drink, and the pleasures of sexual life," "first existence, second sufficient food and clothing, and third development"? There are already many criticisms and refutations by various people, and we do not wish to repeat them here.

However, some people may bring up the following question.

Pa Jen refers to "the things inherent in artistic works which rouse the people of different classes throughout the ages." Surely these things must exist. Otherwise, how is it that the creations of the ancients reflecting their "demands, loves and hopes" can still be enjoyed by us now? If this is so, then what Pa Jen says, "the things which possess the common characteristics of mankind in general" - that is, "basic nature of mankind" - seems to exist also.

Now, this is precisely the hypocritical nature of the theory of models propounded by Pa Jen. This is precisely the core of his theory which we must expose and criticize.

How, then, are we to interpret the phenomenon of "things inherent in artistic works which rouse the people of different social classes throughout the ages?" We must admit that such a phenomenon does exist. Examples are to be found in the story of "Liang Shen-po and Chu Ying-t'ai", the great poems of Chu Yuan, as well as the episodes listed by Pa Jen himself: Pi Kan's cutting up his stomach and his heart; the rebellious love of Chia Pao-yu and Lin T'ai-yu. These things have actually roused people of different ages and different classes. But these incidents cannot be of any help to the theory of model of the basic nature of mankind propounded by Pa Jen.

First of all, in these literary works and artistic forms,

what arouses the people is not any abstract "basic nature of mankind," but things which have clear-cut age, social and class characteristics. The resistance of such people, for example, clearly reflects the characteristics of their class and its class limitations. It is true that the patriotic poetry of Chu Yuan up to now can be sympathized with and enjoyed. The lofty sense of responsibility of the statesman that permeates Chu Yuan's verses and his sharp criticism of the ruling group of the state of Chu reflect his fervent patriotism and his persistent adherence to ideal and loyalty to his personal integrity expressed in the lines:

"The journey is long and dreary,

I shall seek my goal everywhere, above and below."

Be this as it may, it clearly does not show that "the basic nature of mankind" is the cause. His sense of differentiation between good and bad, between right and wrong was built on his concrete political philosophy. He was prepared to devote his life to follow the ancient sages:

"Yao and Shun were correct and unbending,

They pursued the Way and found it."

"T'ang and Yu were upright and respectful,

They followed the Way and never deviated.

They sought the able, and entrusted the talented,

They stuck to principles without wavering." (Li Sao)

He was prepared to pay with his life for his ideal of government, to the extent:

"If I cannot achieve excellent government,

I shall follow in the footsteps of Peng Han."

His ideal was clearly that of the rules of Yao, Shun, T'ang, and Wen and Wu (of Chou). What he opposed were only the bad emperors who had deviated from such ideal government, such as Hsia Chi who was given to enjoyment; I who was given to hunting; and Chieh and Chou, tyrants given to debauchery. So he hoped that his own king would "cultivate the people's hearts", dismiss the "group of courtiers" who

"Indulge in corruption and misgovernment,

And never tire of extorting the people."

He hoped that the king would practice the rule of Confucian benevolence. In this political ideal of his, there was not a single point which did not reflect his fervent patriotism, his class ideology of persistent adherence to ideal.

Pi Kan "remonstrated with his king by cutting up his stomach and gouging his heart." His courageous loyalty was not, as Pa Jen claims, representative of any "lofty" basic nature of mankind. It is clear that Pi Kan was a loyal subject in the slave society, and his "courageous loyalty" was for the class of slave lords. He resorted to the foolish act of cutting up his stomach and gouging his heart to criticize King Chou,

not to overthrow the rule of the slavery system, but only to consolidate this rule.

Naturally we do not demand that Pi Kan and Chu Yuan must surpass their "political ideal." The question is that their "things which rouse the people of different social classes" are not "the basic nature of mankind" which "possesses the common characteristics of mankind in general," but are characteristics which are closely connected with their own class character.

How are we to explain such phenomena? We must carry out a concrete analysis by combining these works with the contents of their artistic forms, although the resistance put up by Pi Kan and Chu Yuan, the resistance put up by Liang Shan-po and Chu Ying-t'ai, and the resistance put up by Chia Pao-yu and Lin T'ai-yu have not exceeded the limits of their respective classes and moreover even clearly revealed the limited nature of their classes.

Pi Kan's cutting up of his body and Chu Yuan's decision to follow the footsteps of Peng Han did not in the least shake the social system. The resistance of Liang Shan-po, Chu Ying-t'ai, Chia Pao-yu and Lin T'ai-yu against the feudal and unreasonable marriage system, feudal oppression, and oppression by social practices ultimately led to the conclusion of tragic defeat. But they have succeeded in rousing readers of different ages because their acts of resistance nevertheless do

expose the cruelty of the slave owners and feudal rulers, and the corruption of the slave system and feudal system. And this is beneficial to the people. Under the historical conditions of their times, they could reveal such a spirit of resistance, and this deserves the sympathy and praise of all people who demand opposition to feudalism. It is not any tale played in "rousing the people" by the abstract "basic nature of humanity" which has no social class content whatsoever.

At the same time, it is also necessary here to carry out a concrete class analysis of the so-called "things which rouse people of different social classes throughout the ages." In fact, no literary model of any kind has ever produced completely unanimous "rousing effect" in "all ages" and among "different social classes." Examples of this truth are numerous.

Take the example of Chu Yuan. Through his great poems he revealed the character of a feudal statesman fervently patriotic, persistent in his ideal and integrity. People of different classes have been "roused" to varying degrees. Upright statesmen in feudal society have seen in Chu Yuan an example for themselves. Thus the great Han historian Sau-ma Chien, after being humiliated with castration, was spiritually influenced by the fact that "Chu Yuan, on being banished, wrote the Li Sao", and exerted efforts to complete his great historical work Shih Chi. But Pan Ku, the author of Han Shu, could not

be "roused" by Chu Yuan. On the contrary, he stood on the side of the ruling class, and criticized Chu Yuan as one who "played up his genius to extol himself."

In addition, there have also been other feudal intellectuals, not possessing the same spirit and character of Chu Yuan in adhering to his ideal and integrity, but because of temporary political setbacks, also started to chant the "Li Sao", and consider themselves "Chu Yuan", giving vent to their melancholy. But when the court start to bestow some favors on such people, the poems of Chu Yuan could no longer "rouse" them.

Among the broad masses of the people, the persistence of Chu Yuan in opposing oppressive rule also indirectly roused the people's resistance against the feudal system, and this is why the people respect him and mourn him.

Similarly, the model characters of Chia Pao-yu, Lin T'ai-yu and Hsueh Pao-chai have also "roused" to varying extent the people of different social classes in different ages. In the case of the character of Hsueh Pao-chai, those who reject her say she is "malicious by nature," "with a heart as inapproachable as the closed gates of a city," and "openly perpetrating her fraud." Those who accept her refer to her as "calm and composed, elegant and stately, and looking like spring." Among feudal intellectuals there are different criticisms of the same character, and they are "roused" in different ways. However, we can

see that their different criticisms have come from the same source of their common conception for the preservation of feudal code of propriety, and they sought to interpret her according to their own concept and demand.

In the hands of Yu P'ing-po, the new school for the study of the novel *Hung-lou-meng*, the whole process is being reversed. He had entirely denied the basic differences in the characters of Lin T'ai-yu and Hsueh Pao-chai, taken out the social contents of the two characters, and declared the "unity of Pao-chai and T'ai-yu", explaining this with the words, "two peaks oppose each other, two rivers flow their different courses, each showing its best, and neither surpassing the other, thereby producing the best of a love situation, the greatest achievement in the quality of literature."

Just take a look. Even with the same model, even among feudal intellectuals, there are different receptions and different reactions. Where is the so-called "thing that rouses people of different classes through all the ages?"

Such is the way literature of the feudal age has "roused" the people and been received by the people. And such is also the way literature of the bourgeois period "roused" the people and received the reaction of the people. The bourgeoisie may be "roused" by the models of anti-feudal literature, but it cannot be "roused" by the revolutionary heroic models. For this reason,

Czarist Russia, at the time developing toward capitalism, though dissatisfied with Tolstoy's exposure of the czarist system and shamelessly altering his works, nevertheless tolerated his personal existence. As to the "mother" of the proletarian revolutionary literature, Gorky, the state to which the Russian rulers were "roused" was only shown in the issuance of an order for his arrest.

Indeed, between Pi Kan and King Chou, there was no common feeling. And between Chu Yuan and King Huai of Chu and his lackeys, there was no common "basic nature of mankind." Chu Yuan's upright and patriotic stand received from the ruling group of Chu at the time only the following:

"The other damsels are jealous of my beauty,

And they falsely accuse me of loose morals."

"The world is used to dirt and does not mind it,

And beauty is covered up and discriminated against."

"The world is used to dirt and shuns the clean,

Beauty is covered up and the evil is extolled."

As to the proletariat, it is true that it is also somewhat "roused" by the literary works and literary models which to a certain extent reflect the interests of the people or are beneficial to the people. However, the proletariat is "roused" even less because, as Pa Jen claims, they reveal the basic nature common to all people, but rather because these works.

were produced with the full estimation of their significance in resisting the class nature of their historical periods.

For the proletariat is the most thorough revolutionary class. Its revolutionary mission is not only to liberate itself but also to thoroughly obliterate the system of exploitation and oppression and to liberate the oppressed of the whole world. Accordingly, all literary and art works and literary models which reveal that they are beneficial to the oppressed people of all ages, resist old systems, and promote the progress of life will be beneficial to the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. Such works will therefore get the sympathy or and "rouse" proletarian readers to varying extent.

However, the proletariat is different from the other ages and the other classes in the reception of, and reaction to all historical literary and art works and literary models. In dealing with the so-called "things that rouse different ages all through the different ages," the proletariat adopts a critical attitude. For example, the proletariat also appreciates the works of Chu Yuan, and accepts his works as a creditable legacy, affirming his role as a great poet of ancient China, and sympathizing with the persecution to which he was subjected. However, in evaluating his work, the proletariat also critically points out the class limitations of his resistance.

It is the same with the treatment of literary models

belonging wholly to the oppressed people in Chinese history. Take for example the heroic symbols of China's revolutionary peasants, Li Kuei, Wu Sung and Lu Chih-shen. Their struggle of resistance against the feudal rulers does indeed rouse the strong sympathy and love of modern China's proletariat. But the revolutionary heroes of the proletariat, and the revolutionary peasants under the leadership of the proletariat, have also from their defeats, absorbed the necessary lessons, and critically accepted their struggle experiences, so that they have taken to an entirely new revolutionary road.

Particularly in dealing with the literary models of the period of the bourgeois revolution, the humanitarians who opposed feudalism, the proletariat must preserve the critical capacity for understanding, on the one hand affirming the historical significance of their opposition to feudalism, and on the other hand exposing their class limitations.

If we say that the heroes of republicanism of the 17th and 18th centuries had the progressive significance of waging a revolutionary struggle against the darkness, theology and divine rights of the Middle Ages, then by the 19th century, the positive significance of the literary models of bourgeois humanitarianism had been greatly reduced. Generally speaking, they used the humanitarian viewpoint to sympathize with the oppressed, but did not call upon the people to carry out a

revolutionary struggle. Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, for example, advocated the use of "patience" and "non-resistance" to convert the rulers. So though they exposed the crimes of the rulers, actually they only hoped that the rulers would carry out some reforms in keeping with "humanitarianism." Pa Jen's "humanitarianism of the basic nature of mankind" is precisely their standard. There is nothing in common between their "humanitarianism of the basic nature of mankind" and the revolutionary humanitarianism of the proletariat.

The proletariat must maintain the capacity for critical understanding of all literary models in history. This is because there is after all a basic difference between the human nature of the proletariat and the human nature of the oppressed of all historical ages. As pointed out in Communist Manifesto, "The Communist revolution is bent on resolutely breaking down the relations of the system of ownership handed down from history; accordingly it is not at all strange that in the course of its own development, it will resolutely break down the various ideas handed down from the past."

But, people may say, there must be points of common contact after all. Though we have here pointed out the different contents of the different classes which have things in common, Marxism does not deny such "commonness", because the human nature of a class is also the fruit of the development of

society. Since the dawn of history, the development of human civilization has principally been during the period of class society. To state it simply, human nature in a class society has always been of two kinds, and they developed along the two extremes opposite each other. That is on the one side the basic nature of the rulers of succeeding ages, and on the other side the basic nature of the ruled.

The basic nature of the first kind is characterized by such traits as avarice, cruelty, exploitation and the plundering of the fruits of labor of others to enrich themselves. The basic nature of the latter kind is characterized by such traits as resistance against unreasonable exploitation and oppression, and aspiration for a beautiful life.

By the time of the final stage of capitalism, that is, imperialism, the basic nature of the rulers has been developed to the point where they are blood-thirsty by habit and mad plunderers (monopoly capitalists). The basic nature of the ruled (the working class) has been developed to the state in which they possess high degree organization, discipline, impartiality, and resolution to carry out the mission of the liberation of humanity,

In Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels said, "Whatever forms this opposition may take, it is a fact common to all centuries of the past that in society one section of the peo-

ple exploited another section of the people. It is therefore not at all strange that the social consciousness of different ages may be varied and multitudinous, it was always developed according to an established common pattern, that is to say, it was always promoted under the ideology that would be eliminated only with the elimination of class opposition."

All the great models in literary works of past historical ages can in certain respects achieve the "common reaction" of the proletariat of today not because of "the brilliance of human nature," or the individual things that "are connected with the basic nature of mankind" as Pa Jen states, but because they have portrayed the "basic nature" of the oppressed.

As to the heroes, the future new rulers who struggle for the new social system, their activities and ideals can also "rouse" and "affect" the oppressed people, and this is also in keeping with the law of development of historical materialism. However, such a phenomenon is not due to any role played by the so-called basic nature of mankind which is common to all people. It still fully reveals the content of a specific class. On this complicated phenomenon in ideology, in "The Ideology of Germany," Marx and Engels made a thorough and penetrating analysis:

"The question is this: any new class which seeks to replace the previous ruling class, to achieve

their goal, cannot but describe its own interests as the common interests of all members of the society, Speaking abstractly, this is giving its own interests the cloak of universality, describing them as the sole rational interests and accepted ideals. The class carrying out the revolution - in the sense only of its opposition to another class - from the very beginning had not emerged as a class, but as representatives of the society. In the capacity of the entire masses, it resisted the sole ruling class. This is because its earliest interests were actually more or less related to the common interests of the other classes which were not in the ruling position, and because its interests, under the oppression of the relationship then existing, had not yet been smoothly developed into the specific interests of a specific class. For this reason, many individuals of the other classes which did not have access to the ruling position also found the interests of this class beneficial to them...."

It can thus be seen that the people of the proletariat had unions based on common interest relations with the bourgeoisie in their common struggle against feudalism. Because of this, in the literature of the period of the rise of the bourgeoisie, the theme of anti-feudalism to a certain

extent also could rouse proletarian readers. This phenomenon also can only find an interpretation in correct class analysis.

From the above analysis, Pa Jen's so-called "things inherent in artistic works which through the ages have roused the people of different social classes," that is, "basic nature of mankind," is clearly a lie that is contrary to history, contrary to realities. Marxism holds that the literary models of any age must first be class models. The relationship between the common nature and the individual nature of the models is not that of leading to opposite directions, but that of mutual penetration. The individual lives of the character also does not lead to any common "basic nature of mankind," but to the common class nature.

The characteristics of the model characters of a class truly can only be revealed by reliance on clear cut individual characters. But an individual character must also be closely tied up with the characteristics of the class in various ways if it is to become a clear cut individual life of a model character. These models as they rouse and affect different classes in different ages, on the one hand do not depart from their model class life, and on the other hand they also clearly reflect the different stands, different degrees of understanding in relation to the literary model. Here we do not find what Pa Jen refers to as the unified "basic nature of mankind" and

the common reaction to it.

However realistic and moving may the revolutionary models of the proletariat be made, all anti-socialist people will not be "roused." Or else they will be only "roused" to the opposite direction. They would insult our literature, insult our heroes. This point alone is sufficient to give Pa Jen the lie.

III

This model theory of "basic nature of mankind" propounded by Pa Jen is no doubt closely connected with his anti-Marxist bourgeois literary viewpoint. This has already been thoroughly revealed in "The Class Nature of Literature," the theoretical foundation for his "Articles on Literature." Although in order to cover himself up, he had greatly "criticized" the theory of human nature. The joke is that only two or three pages later, he returns to vending the thing: "Any concrete person, in addition to the possession of a specific class characteristic and social consciousness, also possesses the common characteristic and common consciousness of mankind in general. In our observation of each concrete person, we must not hold the viewpoint of the theory of the determination of class, and the theory of class status. For the evolution and changes of man's ideas and feelings are very complex, and the man of the 'class' is still the man of 'mankind. This makes it possible for a society divided into classes to give birth to ideas and feelings of

democracy and humanitarianism."

From this passage, we see that Pa Jen uses the words "theory of class status" to make fun of the class theory, and this method is a bad one. We wish to ask him this question. Why is it that in "principle" you "affirm" the class theory, and as soon as you "observe each concrete person," the class theory is ridiculed and denied? It is true that man is complex and because of this, are we to dispense with class analysis? "The man of a class is still the man of mankind." You have completely reversed the order here. The correct statement should be, "The 'man' of humanity is still the 'man' of a class."

Again, "A society divided into classes can give birth to ideas of democracy and humanitarianism." This is also a lame excuse. Does he mean that democracy and humanitarianism are devoid of the class character? Can we confuse as one old democracy and new democracy, or bourgeois humanitarianism and proletarian humanitarianism? Pa Jen's measurement is precisely undertaken to confuse class differences and to pass off the faked as the real, presenting bourgeois things as proletarian things.

Naturally, in presenting the so-called "things which are inherent in artistic works that through the ages rouse the people of different social classes," Pa Jen does not aim at the

repetition of the much profaned reactionary theory of human nature in literature alone, but also seeks to "initiate and lead" and new direction in literature. In the postscript to his "I-ming Chi" (first draft), Pa Jen openly declares, "The main purpose in discussing human feelings is to correct the one-sided nature of our authors in the creation of personalities, in the hope that the authors, in their creation of the forms of class warriors, will instill into them greater brilliance of human nature. It seems that such a hope can be realized."

What, then, is the twinkling "brilliance of human nature" which he hopes for in the forms of the warriors? In his "Letter to the Editorial Department of Hsin Kang", he has given the following interpretation: "The description of class struggle is to make people realize the evil of the existence of classes. We must not merely rouse the people of the same class to take up the struggle, but we should also make the people of the enemy class to tremble or be ashamed, so as to cause their spiritual disintegration. For this we must have as our foundation something which is common to all the people."

What a good form for a "class warrior!" It transpires that the "weapon" for the class struggle is "something common to all the people" (that is the basic nature of mankind) to disintegrate (in effect to "convert") the spirit of the enemy class, so that they will tremble and be shamed to death. What

a sweet lie! Actually what he hopes of the models of proletarian warriors is the "restoration" of the bourgeois "basic nature." He wants the authors, in their creation of model characters, to reject the human nature and human sentiments of the proletariat and replace them with the human nature and human sentiments of the bourgeoisie. The so-called basic nature of mankind "common to all people" is only a pretext.

On the basis of this hope of Pa Jen, authors who are filled with the "sentiments" of Pa Jen will only create forms of "class warriors" of the types of Ting Ling, Hsiao Chun and Lu Ling. They don the dresses of workers, peasants and soldiers, but inherent in their spiritual kingdom is still the ugly soul of the bourgeoisie.

Take the case of Lu Ping, in Ting Ling's story "In the Hospital." Lu Ping "looks out for loopholes where he may launch his attack, with the intensity of seeking out an enemy," "directs everything," and "every day devotes his energy to think and think of ways to attack other people." This is but a new edition of the egoist Miss Sha Fei. She dons the cloak of a member of the Communist Party but is really a mad anti-Party element.

Lu Tung-shan, labor model of new China created by the pen of Hsiao Chun in "The Mines in May," is only a new edition of his "whisker literature." Lu Ling, a member of the Hu Feng clique, in his "Blessings of Youth," describes a group of so-

called workers. Their hysterical state of mind is not much different from the state of mind of Chiang Chun-tsu in his "Children of the Rich."

The bourgeois basic nature of mankind of these people are actually common to all in their writings, and on this point they have actually met the demands of Pa Jen for his sentimental literature. However, there is not the slightest point of similarity between the "new heroic figures" from their pens and the awakened Chinese workers, peasants and Communist Party members. Their "commonness" is only the self expansion of the mental state of the authors themselves. Accordingly, the realization of Pa Jen's hope for models glittering with the brilliance of human nature will result in the denial of socialist literature, and at the same time the denial of the true people of socialism. This "commonness" is used to pave the way for the restoration of capitalism. Such is the real face of the models of the "basic nature of mankind."

However, like all revisionists, while he is actually opposing Marxism, Pa Jen will insist that he is a believer in Marxism. He uses Marxist phrases as decorative material, usurps individual chapters and sections and individual phrases and sentences from Marxist theories, cuts them up and distorts them, and uses them as pretexts for the propagation of his reactionary viewpoints.

In presenting his sentimental literature and the model theory of the basic nature of mankind, Pa Jen insists that he had received "revealtion" from a passage in Marx and Engels' "Strange Family." Because this passage affects the theoretical foundation of Pa Jen's model theory of the basic nature of mankind, and as Pa Jen continuously uses it as a shield to protect himself and attack other people's criticism of him, we may here reproduce the passage, and study it, to see if there is any link between this passage from Marx and Engels and Pa Jen's sentimental literature and model theory of the basic nature of mankind:

The bourgeois and the proletarian are both the self transformation of man. In the course of the transformation, the bourgeois feels that he was being satisfied and consolidated, and he held such transformation as the evidence of his own strength and in the course of the transformation he acquired the outward appearance of man's existence. The proletarian feels in the transformation that he is being destroyed, and sees in it his ineffectiveness and the reality of the non-existence of man. Using the words of Hegel, this class, under the abandoned condition is indignant over it. That such indignation must grow in this class is due to its basic nature of mankind and its open, drastic and overall denial of the living conditions

of this basic nature - a contradiction.

Because in this passage there are such terms as "self transformation" and "basic nature of mankind," Pa Jen has found in it his life saviour. He thinks he has found the "theoretical foundation" for his sentimental literature with "things common to all mankind." So he has not only requested quoted the passage as his basis, but has also buoyantly sought to teach other people, saying, "The advocates of the class theory in literature do not seem to understand this key." It seems that this "key" has become the basis for his use of the sentimental theory to deny the class theory, as if Marx and Engels, in writing the quoted passage more than one hundred years ago, were paving the way to his literature of "things which are common to all mankind."

This book of Marx and Engels was written in 1844, that is to say, in the period of the creation of Marxism. During this time, the two were just beginning to create the theory of scientific socialism, and in their phrasology and use of terms they still made use of certain things in classical philosophy. Take this term "basic nature of mankind," it refers to the conception of the anthropologism propounded by Feuerbach. On the matter of anthropologism, in the later writings of Marx and Engels, it was criticized.

Even in Marx's work on Feuerbach written in 1845, he had

already begun to criticize the social theories of Feuerbach.

Sections 6 and 10 both clearly discussed the idea on "man."

"Feuerbach has restored the nature of religion to the nature of man. But the basic nature of man is not the abstract nature possessed by the individual persons. Realistically, it is the sum total of all social systems." "Old materialism had for its standpoint the society of 'citizens.' New materialism has for its standpoint the society of mankind, or socialized mankind."

In his work, "Feuerbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy," Engels also criticized his view of the abstract "man." He said, "On the matter of form, Feuerbach is realistic. He made man the starting point. But he basically did not touch upon the world in which this man lives. So this man of his is still that abstract man in religious philosophy. This man does not come out of the womb of his mother. Like the butterfly, he comes out of a chrysalis, from the god of atheism. For this reason, he cannot live in the realistic, historically developed, and historically affirmed world. Though he moves with other men, but each one of them is abstract like himself."

Engels finally further emphatically pointed out, "Worship of the abstract man, the core of the new religion of Feuerbach, must be replaced by the science of the realistic man and the historical development of the man." Is not this a pointed criticism of the so-called "things common to all man-

kind?

Of course, without even quoting these passages from Marx and Engels, and looking at the quotation from "Strange Family" alone, we likewise fail to see any connection between it and the corrupt theory of Pa Jen's on the model theory of the basic nature of mankind. Looking at the passage as a whole, Marx and Engels are clearly describing the conditions of the division of society into classes and the birth of the acute class struggle. They very clearly point out the content of the realistic society of the self transformation of the proletariat.

When Lenin read this passage, in his article "Summary of Marx and Engels' Strange Family" he commented: "This very clearly brings forward the viewpoint which Marx appeared to have already evolved on the role of the proletarian revolution" (Lenin, Complete Works, Vol. XXXVIII, p.9.) But Pa Jen thinks he has found a treasure, and from this passage which analyzes the sharply antagonistic class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the spirit of materialism which permeates the struggle, he has found the "corner stone" for such corrupt views of sentimentalism, "things common to all men" and "the humanitarianism of the basic nature of mankind." And he attempts to harmonize class contradictions and to revise the Marxist theory of the proletarian class struggle. Such laughable tactics will achieve nothing else but the exposure

of himself.

Enough has been said. This article is not intended to undertake an overall criticism of Pa Jen's literary viewpoint in its entirety. However, merely from his model theory, we can already see the real face of this revisionist.

Written in the suburb of Peiping, on
the night of 14 March 1960.

THE AUTHORS OF THE MARXIST CLASSICS
ON BOURGEOIS HUMANITARIANISM

[The following is a full translation of an article entitled "Ma-k'o-sau chu-i ching-tien tso-chia lun tzu-ch'an chiai-chi jen-tao chu-i," (English version as above), appearing in Wen-i Pao (Literary Gazette), No.9, Peiping, 11 May 1960, pp 4-17.]

(Wen-i Pao Editor's Comment.) Like the conceptions of democracy, freedom and equality, the general conception of humanitarianism is a product of history. The core of bourgeois humanitarianism is individualism. It serves the strategic objectives of the bourgeoisie. When the bourgeoisie was still a revolutionary class, the spokesmen of this class had put up the standard of humanitarianism and struggled against feudal humanitarianism. However, as the proletariat stepped on the political stage, and with the daily rise of the revolutionary waves of the proletariat, humanitarianism has more and more become a tool used by the bourgeoisie to cover up capitalism's merciless exploitation and oppression, to cover up class contradictions, and to deceive the proletariat and the working people. Some humanitarians of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie have more or less exposed the dark phenomena of capitalist

society, but at the same time they have instilled into the masses revisionism, pacifism, and non-resistance, all poisonous materials which have played a great role in paralyzing the people.

Modern revisionists futilely attempt to carry out the battle of digging at the heart from within the internal ranks of the working class. Under the name of the abstract humanitarianism, they vend the opium of bourgeois humanitarianism. The humanitarianism they advocate is nothing but the use of revisionism to oppose the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship; the use of pacifism to oppose the masses of the people's resistance against aggression, against oppression with their revolutionary war; the use of individualism to oppose collectivism; and the use of the theory of human nature to oppose the class theory.

All these serve their aim of opposition to socialism and opposition to Communism. To confuse the boundaries between proletarian ideology and bourgeois ideology, the revisionists intentionally confuse Communism with humanitarianism, arbitrarily claiming the Communism is the realization of humanitarianism. Revisionists in the literary field particularly beautify the humanitarianism of the literature of nineteenth century Germany, arbi-

trarily claiming that the spirit of humanitarianism is the spirit of socialism. They are particularly enthusiastic over the propagation of the theory of human nature, which is hypocritical to the greatest degree. The abstract "human nature," or "common nature of mankind," which in effect is the corrupt bourgeois human nature, is arbitrarily interpreted as the panacea which rouses readers of all ages and all classes. These views have for a time confused some people.

Opposed to bourgeois humanitarianism, we advocate proletarian revolutionary humanitarianism. This does not in the slightest mean that Communism is turned into the realization of humanitarianism, nor is it in any way the abstract succession to bourgeois humanitarianism. It is giving revolutionary new content to this old term of humanitarianism. The proletarian revolution wipes out all exploitation and oppression, uproots the sources of war, and with uninterrupted revolution seeks human progress and permanent peace. This only is the most thorough, the most lofty humanitarianism. Proletarian literature and art is filled with the spirit of this lofty humanitarianism.

Bourgeois humanitarianism is compatible with Communism. The authors of the classic works of Marxism have

over a long term and untiringly struggled against bourgeois humanitarianism, penetratingly exposed this hypocritical doctrine and its philosophical foundation, the theory of human nature, and its reactionary character. To assist readers to see through the weakness of bourgeois humanitarianism, and to struggle against the deceptive propaganda of revisionism, we have compiled the statements of the authors of the classics of Marxism relating to this question to form the present study material. We welcome comrades to supplement our omissions.

May 1960.

I. Bourgeois Humanitarianism is a Hypocritical Doctrine; It Strives to Consolidate the Existence of Bourgeois Society

Among the bourgeoisie, some people want to cure the ills of society to seek the consolidation of the existence of the bourgeois society.

Among this group of people are economists, advocates of universal love, humanitarians, the group seeking the improvement of the working class, organizers of philanthropic enterprises, members of the society for the protection of animals, sponsors of the temperance society movement, and all kind of insignificant revisionists. Such kinds of bourgeois socialism have even

been organized into complete systems.

Let us take for example Proudhon's book, "Philosophy of Poverty."

Socialist property owners want to preserve the conditions for the existence of modern society, but they also do not want the struggle and danger that these conditions must lead to. They want to preserve modern society, but do not want those factors which may lead to the society facing a revolution and the danger of disintegration. They only want the bourgeoisie and do not want the proletariat. To the bourgeoisie, the world ruled by the bourgeoisie is naturally the most beautiful world. Bourgeois socialism processes this view which comforts the people, and produces more or less complete systems. It calls on the proletariat to realize its system, to enter New Jerusalem. But in effect it only wants the proletariat from beginning to end to remain at the present society, wants the proletariat to abandon the idea of looking upon this society as an abhorrible thing.

This socialism has also a kind of less complete, but more practical form. It strives to make the working class to hold a negative attitude toward all revolutionary movements. It arbitrarily says that it can bring to the working class not through this kind or that kind of political reform, but merely by the change of material living conditions, that is, economic

relations.

However, this change in the material living conditions referred to by such socialism is absolutely not the elimination of the bourgeois production relationships which can only be realized through a revolution, but rather a kind of administrative reform. This reform is carried out on the foundation of the existing relations of production, and so it would not in the least promote a change in the relations between capital and employed labor. At most it could only reduce for the bourgeois its expenditure for exercising its rule and simplify the affairs of state.

(Extract from Marx and Engel: "Communist Manifesto,"

see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV,

pp. 498-499.)

Socialism⁽¹⁾ has become habitually used to the tactic of the loud discussion and singing of high falutin tunes. Viewed from another side, so long as there are no poor people, everything will be satisfactory. Such a view can be applied to any object. Its real content is the hypocritic vulgarism of the small citizen under the cover of philanthropy. It fully agrees with the positive side of existing society. What causes it pain is that in addition to the positive side, there is also the other side - poverty. Such vulgarism has been merged with modern

society as a single body, and its sole hope is that modern society should continue to exist, but without the conditions for its existence.

(Extract from Engels: "German Socialism in Poetry and Prose," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, page 239.)

Next is the school of humanitarianism. This school is rather concerned over the bad side of the production relations of the present age. To clear their conscience, members of this school hope to ease as much as possible the present antagonism. They express sincere sorrow for the sufferings of the proletariat and the fierce competition among the property owners. They ask the workers to stay by their posts and work properly, and to raise less children. They recommend that the bourgeoisie regulate a bit their enthusiasm for production.

The school of universal love is a perfect sect of the school of humanitarianism. Its members deny the naturalness of antagonism. They want to turn all people into property owners. They want to realize their theory, because their theory is different from practice and does not include resistance. There is no doubt that in theory it is no difficult to disregard the contradictions which must be met with at each step of the realities. And so this theory becomes idealized

reality. Accordingly the advocates of universal love are prepared to preserve the categories which manifest bourgeois relations, and do not want the things which constitute the real content of these categories and the opposition which cannot be separated from these categories. The advocates of universal love think that they are solemnly opposing the property class, but in fact more than any other people they resemble the property class.

(Extract from Marx: "The Poverty of Philosophy," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.IV, pp.156-157).

Adam Smith eulogized commerce, saying that commerce is humane. This is correct. In this world there is actually nothing which is absolutely immoral. Commerce has shown due respect for morals and human nature. However, we must see how it shows it! When the rule of force of the Middle ages, that is, open highway robbery, was transformed into mercantilism, such action became more humane. Today, when in commerce the stage of the ban of export of currency was transformed into the doctrine of mercantilism, commerce has also become more humane. And now even this doctrine itself has become more humane.

Naturally, in his own interests, a merchant must preserve good relations with those who sell to him cheaply and those who buy from him at high prices. And so if a nation is to incur the

hostility of its suppliers and its customers, it will be very foolish indeed. The more it shows its friendliness, the more it will benefit. Herein lies the humanitarianism of the merchants, and this hypocritical means of employing ethics to achieve an unethical end is the thing which the free traders take pride in.

The hypocrites say, "Do we not overthrow the barbarism of monopoly? Do we not bring civilization to the desolate areas? Do we not reduce war and promote harmony among nations?" It is true that they have done these things. But how have you done it? You have eliminated small monopolies, to enable the endless development more freely for the system of private ownership, which is a colossal and basic monopoly. You have brought civilization to all corners of the earth, because you want to seize new worlds to develop your base greed. You have made different nations form fraternities (but these are fraternities of brigandage), you have reduced war, in order that you may achieve larger ill-gotten gains in peace, in order that the hatred and shameful competition among individual beings may be promoted to the most acute stage. At what time have you done things which are purely motivated by humanitarian considerations, stemming forth from the idea that there should be no antagonism between public interests and individual interests? At what time have you considered ethics, at what time have you refrained from seeking self interest, and not concealing in your heart the evil thought

which is unethical and selfish?

(Extract from Engels: "Outline of Critique of Political Economy," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, pp. 601-602.)

Please do not think that the "educated" British people will openly admit such selfishness. On the contrary, they will use the most shameful mask of hypocrisy to cover it up. Why, does it mean that the British wealthy people do not show concern for the poor? Have they not operated charity organizations not found in any other country? Yes, these charity organs! You have sucked the very last drop of blood from the proletariat. And then you give them a small favor to satisfy your own hypocritical soul, and to pose before the world as the benefactors of mankind (though you are only returning but one percent of what your exploited people should get). It seems to you that you are benefitting the proletariat. Such charity makes the giver more morally bankrupt than the receiver. Such charity makes the insulted the more insulted. It demands that the low people who have been rejected by society and lost their human faces to abandon their very last possession - the name of man. Before the alms have put on the unfortunate people the imprint of the abandoned, such charity further requires that these unfortunates bend their knees and beg for it.

(Extract from Engels: "Conditions of the British

Working Class," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, pp. 566-567.)

Gasping for breath, the "salon" democrats say, "Ko-erh-tien" is "man," he is humane.

This respect for the humanitarianism of Ko-erh-tien not only leads us to think of Nikolasov and Saltykov, but also leads us to think of Turgnev's "diary of the Hunter". Before us is a civilized educated landlord, with refined movements, a gentle disposition, and the bearing of a European. The landlord invites his guest to a drink and they engage in conversation. He asked the servant, "Why is the wine not warm?" The servant was silent and turned pale. The landlord pressed a bell, and said lightly to the servant who came in, "The matter of Fei-to-erh, you handle it."

Let us take a look. This is the model of the humanitarianism of Ko-erh-tien, or a la Ko-erh-tien. The landlord under the pen of Turgnev, compared with Sha-erh-t'e-chi-ha, is also a "humane" person. For example, he is so humane that he does not want to go personally to the stavle to see if the matter of the thrashing of Fei-erh-to is being properly carried out. He is so humane that he does not bother to show concern over the fact as to whether the whip used to thrash Fei-erh-to has been immersed in salt water. This landlord never beats

or scholars his servants personally, but only "deals" with them from a distance. He does not speak, does not make a noise, and does not show his hand openly ...truly like an educated, moderate and kind person.

So is the humanitarianism of Ko-erh-tien. He himself never joined Leonosky, Fydorov and company to beat up and oppress the peasants. He also did not join Lien-ning-k'ian-fu and Mei-li-erh-icha K'o-mei-ssu-chi and others to carry out the punitive campaign. He did not join Tu-pa-so-fu in shooting down the people of Moscow. He was so humane, that he relinquished such meritorious services and allowed the heroes of the all-Russian "stable" to "handle" them, while he himself sat in his quiet study leading the political parties supporting Tu-pa-so-fu, allowing the leaders of this political party to raise their glasses in congratulation of Tu-pa-so-fu's victory over the people of Moscow. Was this not humane when he sent Tu-pa-so-fu's elements to "handle the matter of Fei-to-erh", and he personally would not go to the stable? In the eyes of the old women who control the political columns of our liberal and democratic papers, he is a model of humanitarianism a good man who would not even harm a fly. To support the Tu-pa-so-fu elements, to enjoy the fruits of the acts of suppression of these elements, and yet not to share responsibility for the - this is truly "rare good fortune."

(Extract from Lenin: "In Memory of Count Ko-erh-tien"
see "Complete Works of Lenin", Vol. XIII, pp 39-40.)

II. Universal Love Theorists Futilely Hope for Great
Compassion from Bourgeoisie; Revisionism Is Tool
for Erosion of Working Class

The poet has never threatened to obliterate the actual powers of Lu-t'e-hsi-erh-t'e, to obliterate the social relationship which constitutes the foundation of such powers. He only hopes that such power is exercised more humanely. He regrets that the banker is not a socialist believer in universal love, not an idealist, not a good man among mankind, but merely a banker. Baker eulogized the vulgarity of the timide small citizen. He eulogized the poor people, eulogized the pauvre honteux - a man with a base, sincere and mutually contradictory aspiration - and eulogized all kinds and types of "small fries." But he did not eulogize the strong, the powerful and revolutionary proletarian.

Baker seriously threatened and castigated the Lu-t'e-hsi-erh-t'e family. Though the writer might be well intentioned, the impression he gave readers is even more farcial than the sermons of the Capuchins.⁽²⁾ The threat and castigation came from his infantile illusions for the labors of the Lu-t'e-hsi-erh-t'e family, completely failing to understand the link between
ween

this force and the existing relationships. He had a very wrong idea about the means to which this family must resort to build up its strength and to permanently preserve it.

Timidity and ignorance, womanish emotions, and the base vulgarity of the petty bourgeoisie - these were the Muses which struck the chord in the heart of the poet. They did their best to make themselves look dignified and formidable, but all was futile and only served to reveal their ridiculous position.

The baritone voice they sang with their suppressed tones was often distorted into amusingly sharp and strange shrieks. Their dramatic portrayal would turn the great struggle of Enceladus⁽⁴⁾ into the somersault of a funny clown.

(Extract from Engels: "German Socialism in Poetry and Prose," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, pp. 223-224.)

He should let them forget egoism, forget deception and usurious exploitation. In a word, he should assume the attitude of the missionary, clad in thorns and covered with dust, calling on people to do good and to repent. The great demand of our poet was no different from a demand to Louis Philip to teach the bourgeoisie nurtured in the July Revolution to abolish the system of private ownership. That is, if Lu-t'e-hsi-erh-t'e and Louis Philip were really that mad. Then their

powers would soon vanish. But Jews would surely not cease to trade, and the bourgeoisie would surely not forget the system of private ownership.

.....

If Mr. Lu-t'e-hsi-erh-t'e would just have a little conscience, then he could completely prevent the development of commerce and industry, competition, the accumulation of assets, state debts, and speculation. In a word, he could have prevented the development of modern bourgeois society. Only when one really possessed toute la desolante naivete de la poesie allemande (the entire intolerable infantilism of German poetry) would he dare to publish such a fairy tale. Here Lu-t'e-hsi-erh-t'e became a real Aladdin. (5)

(Extract from Engels: "German Socialism in Poetry and Prose," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, pp. 229-230.)

They are some representatives of the petty bourgeoisie who say, in a voice filled with fear, that the proletariat, pushed forward by its own revolutionary status in society, may "proceed too far." They do not adopt the resolute political stand of opposition, but carry out universal compromise. They do not struggle against the government and the bourgeoisie, but attempt to induce them by persuasion to come over to their side. They do not fiercely resist the persecution coming from above.

but are docile and submissive, and also acknowledge that crime should be punished. All natural conflicts in history have been interpreted as misunderstandings, and all arguments can be concluded by saying that actually there are no differences on both sides.

Those who appeared in 1848 as members of the bourgeois democratic party can today likewise appear as members of the socialist democratic party. Just as what the democratic republic was to the former group, so the decadence of the capitalist system is to the latter group a thing in the distant future, and of not the slightest significance to contemporary political practice. So they can proceed without restraint to compromise, to attempt to appeasement and charity.

It is the same with the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. On paper they accept this struggle, because it is now practically impossible to deny it. But in practice they obliterate it, and dampen it. The socialist democratic party should not be the political party of the working class, should not incur the hatred of the bourgeoisie or the hatred of any other quarter. It should first carry out vigorous propaganda among the bourgeoisie. The party should not place in positions of importance those people who can intimidate the bourgeoisie and have as its goal ends which our generation cannot achieve. It is best that it uses all its efforts and energy for the rea-

lization of the measures of improvement proposed by the petty bourgeoisie, measures that will consolidate the old social system, so that the ultimate great collapse may be transformed into a change that may be gradually realized and as much as possible peacefully.

Such people are busy in strenuously covering the fact that not only they are doing nothing themselves, but also plan to see that nothing is done except empty talk. Such were precisely the people who during 1848-1849, due to their fear for every action, obstructed the movement which finally ended in defeat. Such are the people who never see the reaction-ries, but are greatly surprised when they find themselves plunged into the state in which they cannot resist and from which they cannot escape. Such are precisely the people who want to put history within the scope of their own ignorance. But history does not want them, and proceeds on its own journey.

Whenever the class struggle is made into an unpleasant and "brutal" thing and is being repulsed, there what is left behind will be nothing except empty talk about "real universal love" and "righteousness."

(Extract from Marx and Engels: "To O Pei-peierh

and others," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels,

Vol. II, pp. 483-484.)

A Marxist is different from an anarchist. He accepts the struggle for reform, that is, under the situation in which the ruling class is still in control of the state power, we must struggle for the improvement of the lot of workers. But at the same time, the Marxist resolutely opposes the revisionist who directly and indirectly limit the aspirations and activities of the working class within the scope of improvement. Revisionism is the deception of the workers by the bourgeoisie, because so long as the rule of capital exists, even though individual reforms are carried out, the workers remain hired slaves.

The liberal bourgeoisie generally dispenses reforms with one hand and takes them back with the other so that they become nought. They use such reforms to enslave the workers, to split the workers into individual units, in order to permanently consolidate the system of hired slavery. For this reason, revisionism, even if it is completely sincere revisionism, in effect becomes the tool of the bourgeoisie to erode and weaken the working class. The experiences in different countries have proved that workers who believe in revisionism find themselves ultimately cheated.

To the contrary, if the labor leaders understand the doctrine of Marx, that is, if they realize that so long as capital remains in the ruling position, the system of hired slavery will remain, then they will not fall victims to any

bourgeois reforms. The workers understand that under the condition of the existence of capitalism, there can be neither permanent reforms nor important reforms. So they strive to improve their conditions by themselves, and utilize these improvements to further stubbornly struggle against the system of hired slavery. The revisionists do their best to use small favors and gifts to split up and deceive the workers, so that they may not struggle against their class. After the workers realize that revisionism is a deception, they utilise reforms to develop and expand their class struggle.

The greater influence the revisionists exert over the workers, the weaker will the workers become and the more dependant they will be on the bourgeoisie. The latter will more easily use all sorts of tricks to liquidate the reforms. The more independent, sovereign and penetrating is the labor movement, and the more extensive its goal, the more will it escape the restrictions imposed by the limited scope of revisionism, and the workers will be better able to consolidate and utilize individual reforms.

(Extract from Lenin: "Marxism and Revisionism," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XII, pp. 372-373.)

The bourgeoisie is liberal and counter revolutionary. This has led to the birth of revisionism which is weak and

pitiful to the point of laughable. They dream about reform but are afraid to settle accounts with the serf masters seriously. The serf masters not only will deny reforms but also will take away reforms already introduced. So there is the desire for reform, but fear of a mass movement. There is the desire to resist the serf lords, but also fear for the loss of their support, fear for the loss of one's own privileges.

(Extract from Lenin: "Some Questions in Dispute," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XIX, pp 147.)

To many writers, the development of history is not the replacement of old things by new things, but the exertion of various efforts to preserve the old things and prevent their destruction. It is not the use of class struggle to overthrow the reactionary feudal rulers who should be overthrown, but, like Wu Hsuan, the rejection of class struggle of the oppressed and surrender to the reactionary feudal rulers.

Our writers do not study the kind of people who constituted enemies who oppressed the Chinese people in history, and whether there is anything worthy of praise in the people who surrendered to the enemy and served the enemy. Our writers also do not study the new social and economic situations, the new class forces, the new personalities and the new ideas which have struggled against the old social and economic situation

and its superstructures (such as politics and culture) in China during the period of more than 100 years since the Opium War of 1840. They have not carried out such studies for the determination as to what things merit eulogy, and what things do not, and what things must be opposed.

(Extract from "Mao Tse-tung on Literature", People's Literary Publishing House 1958 edition, p. 39.)

III. We Cannot Hope for Abolition of Private
Ownership Through Peaceful Means; There
Can Be No Permanent Peace If Imperialism
Is Not Wiped Out

The sixteenth question: Can we abolish the system of private ownership through peaceful means?

The answer: We wish we can. Communists may be those are are least opposed to such means. Communists know clearly that all careful plotting will not only be useless but also harmful. They realize very clearly that a revolution cannot be made to order. A revolution anywhere is the natural outcome of various conditions which are completely beyond the control of individual political parties or the wishes and leadership and entire classes. But they also see that in practically all civilized countries, the development of the proletariat has been suppressed by force, and such acts on the part of the enemies

of Communism are tantamount to the taking of all steps to rouse a revolution. So, if all these things will ultimately push the oppressed proletariat forward to the revolution, then at that time we Communists will use practical action to defend the cause of the proletariat, just as we use words to defend it at the present.

(Extract from Engels: "The Principles of Communism,"

see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p. 366.)

Disarmament is the ideal of socialism. In a socialist society, there will be no war, and so we can afford to be disarmed. However, he is no socialist who hopes that we can realize socialism without going through the social revolution and the proletarian dictatorship. Dictatorship is a state power that directly relies on brutal force. In the 20th century (and the entire age of civilization), brutal force does not come from the fist, or the stick, but from the army. To include "disarmament" in the political platform signifies our opposition to the use of armed weapons. This is equally devoid of Marxist flavor as to say that we oppose the use of brutal force.

(Extract from Lenin: "On the Slogan of Disarmament,"

see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXIII, p. 93.)

Socialism opposes the use of brutal force against the nationalities. This is an indisputable fact. Socialism also

generally opposes the use of brutal force against the people. However, apart from the anarchists who believe in Christianity and the Tolstoyists, nobody will draw from this the conclusion that socialist opposes revolutionary brutal force. It will be seen that merely to speak of "brutal force" generally, and not to analyze the different conditions in reactionary brutal force and revolutionary force will make one a philistine who runs counter to the revolution, or else a person who just carries on a lame excuse to deceive himself and other people.

(Extract from Lenin: "The Proletarian Revolution and Rebel Kautsky," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 266-267.)

No revolutionary class can afford to swear that it will not carry out a revolutionary war, for otherwise it must fall into the abyss of silly pacifism. We are not Tolstoyists. If the revolutionary class seizes state power, if in such a country there is no further annexation, if the state power belongs no more to the banks and the big capitalists - it is not easy to achieve this in Russia - then not only in words but also in practice it is carrying out a revolutionary war. It can never afford to give a pledge not to carry out such a war. If it does so, it will be plunged into Tolstoyism, plunged into vulgarism. It will have forgotten complete the science of Marxism

and the revolutionary experiences of Europe.

(Extract from Lenin: "First Congress of All-Russia Soviet of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXV, p. 23.)

"Pacifism and abstract propaganda on peace constitute a form for the swindling of the working class. ...Today, to propagate peace and fail at the same time to call on the masses for revolutionary action will only disseminate illusions, and lead the proletariat into believing the benevolence of the bourgeoisie so that it will become a toy of the secret diplomacy of the belligerent powers." So wrote the Po-erh-ai Resolution of our party.

(Extract from Lenin: "On Russia's Current Slogan: Peace Without Cession of Territory and Independence of Poland," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXII, p. 131.)

Socialists always condemn war among the people of different nations and consider it a barbarous and cruel act. But our attitude toward war has differences in principle compared with that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and the anarchists. We are different from the bourgeois pacifists because we know that there is a natural link between war and domestic class struggle, we know that war cannot be

obliterated if class is not obliterated and socialism is not established. We fully accept the reasonableness of domestic war, that is, the war of the oppressed classes against the oppressor classes, the war of the slaves against the serf lords, the war of the peasant slaves against the landlords, and the war of the hired workers against the bourgeoisie. We accept the progressiveness and the naturalness of these wars. We Marxists are different from both the pacifists and the anarchists. We feel we must study different wars historically (in accordance with the dialectical materialist viewpoint of Marx.)

(Extract from "Socialism and War", see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXI, p. 279.)

Wars in history can be divided into two kinds, just and unjust. All progressive wars are just and all wars impeding progress are unjust. We Communists are opposed to all unjust wars that impede progress, but we are not opposed to progressive, just wars. As for the wars of the latter kind, we Communists not only do not oppose them, but will participate actively in them.

The first world war, an instance of the wars of the former kind, was fought by both sides in the interests of imperialism, and therefore was firmly opposed by the Communists of the whole world. The way to oppose a war of this kind is to prevent

it by all means before it breaks out and, after it has broken out, to oppose war with war, to oppose unjust war with just war, whenever possible.

Japan's war is an unjust war impeding progress, which the peoples of the world, including the people of Japan, should oppose and are opposing. In China, all sections of the nation, from the people to the government, from the Communist Party to the Kuomintang, have all hoisted the banner of justice and carried on a national revolutionary war against aggression. Our war is sacred, just, progressive and aims at peace. We aim at peace not only in one country but also throughout the world, and we not only aim at temporary peace but at permanent peace.

In order to achieve this objective, we must wage a life and death war, must be prepared to sacrifice anything, and must fight to the last until our aim is achieved. The sacrifice may be great and the time long, but there already lies clearly before us a new world of permanent peace and permanent light. Our faith in waging war is based upon this struggle for a new China and a new world of permanent peace and permanent light. Fascism and imperialism want to prolong the war indefinitely, but we want to bring it to a conclusion in the not distant future.

To attain this end, the great majority of mankind must exert their utmost. The 450 million people of China constitute one quarter of the world's population: if they strive together

to overthrow Japanese imperialism and create a new China, of freedom and equality, their contribution to the struggle for permanent world peace will no doubt be extremely great. This is not a vain hope, for the whole world is approaching this point in the course of its social and economic development and, with the effort of the majority of mankind thrown in, our objective will surely be attained in a few decades.

(Extract from Mao Tse-tung: "On Protracted War," see Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. II pp. 465-466.)

IV. We Cannot Confuse Communism with Humanitarianism;
Oppose the Attempt to Turn Communism into the
Dreamy Word "Love."

So I do not advocate that we hoise any banner of doctrinairism. To the contrary, we should as much as possible help the dogmatists understand clearly the significance of their principles. There is for example the abstract conception that Communism is particularly a kind of dogma,⁽⁶⁾ and I do not merely refer to the Communism which may possibly exist in certain imaginations, but the Communism which actually exists and is advocated by such people as Cha-pei, T'ie-sha-mi and Wei-t'ie-lin⁽⁷⁾. Such Communism is only the special manifestation of the principles of humanitarianism, and is not yet rid of the

influence of the existence of its opposite, the system of private ownership.

(Extract from Marx: "M to R," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, p. 416.)

This kind of "real socialism" is only the metamorphosis of proletarian Communism and those somewhat similar parties in Britain and France in the space of the spirit of the German people and the hearts of the German people which we are about to see. "Real socialism" would have people believe that it is founded on "science, but in fact it is itself a certain kind of secret science. Its theoretical works only exist for those who have acquired the secret of "the spirit of thinking."

But it also has literature open to the public. Because it is concerned with social and public relationships, it must carry out certain propaganda on this point. In these publicly circulated works, it is no longer appealing to the "spirit of thinking" of the Germans, but appealing to the "hearts" of the German people. For "real socialism," this is easier, because since it is concerned no longer with actual people but "abstract" people, it has lost all revolutionary zeal. What it propagates is not revolutionary zeal, but universal love of mankind.

And so their call is not on the proletariat, but the two types of the people most numerous in Germany; the petty

petty bourgeoisie who hold illusions of universal love, and the thinkers of this class, that is, the philosophers and the younger ones in the philosophical field. Its appeal is generally addressed to the "common" and uncommon concepts held by those of the ruling class in Germany today.

Because of the various relationships factually existent in Germany, this middle-way school has emerged unavoidably, this attempt to harmonize and compromise Communism with the ideas of the ruling class.

(Extract from Marx and Engels: "Real Socialism," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.III, pp. 458-459, Russian edition.)

The view making the socialist society a paradise of equality is related to the old slogan of "freedom, equality and love," a one-sided French view, was at the time and in the circumstances correct as a definite stage of development. But today we must overcome this view as we overcame all the one-sided views of the former socialist schools. This is because it can only lead to confusion, and because we now have a more correct method to explain this question.

(Extract from Engels: "To Pei-pej-erh," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.II, p.41.)

In Germany there is in our party a decadent air, and it

is not as strong among the masses as it is among the leaders (coming from the ranks of the upper strata and "workers"). The compromise with Lasalle also led to compromise with other elements lacking in thoroughness, and compromise in Berlin (such as Moleschott) with Duhrin and his worshippers. There was also compromise with a group of infantile university students and extremely wise scholars; these people would point out to socialism a "higher idealist" direction, that is to say, they would use new myths and their goddesses of justice, freedom, equality and love to replace the materialist foundation (if we will quote them as bases, we must first earnestly and objectively study them.)

(Extract from Marx: "To Tso-erh-pei," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXV, p. 387.)

The above described nature of the revolution⁽⁹⁾ has led to the birth, one after another, of non-party organizations, and this is very natural. Under such a situation, the whole movement must superficially bear non-partisan traces, and be not-partisan outwardly, but naturally only outwardly. The demand for "humanitarian" civilized living, the demand for alliance, and the demand for the preservation of one's self-respect and human rights and civic rights, have covered everything and joined all classes, greatly surpassing all party

character, and rousing the people who are very far from being raised to a high level of party character.

Because urgent demands are for the realization of direct and necessary minimum rights and reforms, so all future things are postponed for consideration later. The enthusiasm for the immediate struggle (this is necessary and rational, for otherwise there can be no victory in the struggle) has led people to idealize the immediate and minimum objectives, making them perfect, and even placing over them the cloak of idealism. Common democracy, that is common bourgeois democracy, has been made into socialism, and included in the "category" of socialism.

(Extract from Lenin: "The Socialist Parties and the Non-Party Revolutionary Character," see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol.X, pp.56-57.)

And so, in this single issue of the paper, a rough calculation reveals 35 types of the expression of love. According to such trash on love. K'o-li-kai in the article "Reply to Sc-erh-ta" and elsewhere have described Communism into something filled with love and opposed to egoism, and summarized the revolutionary movements of world historical significance in a few words: love and hate; communism and egoism.

This has precisely revealed his cowardice: he carried the favor of the usurers, consenting not to touch the things

had already belonged to them. He pledged not to "undermine the life of the state, the lingering after the state and the nation" and said he only wanted to "realize these wishes." He stated that Communism was not "destruction," but the "realization" of the existing corrupt relationships and the illusions for such relationships on the part of the bourgeoisie - a cowardly and false theory. All this permeates from beginning to end every issue of the paper "People's Tribune."

Such dreamy talk about love will turn both the sexes into nervous wrecks, will make large numbers of young girls hysterical and anaemic. On this point, Ko-li-kai himself should give some thought.

(Extract from "Oppose the Announcement of K'o-li-kai,"
see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.IV, pp 8-9.)

(9) "Do you mean that we cannot solemnly deal with the agitation of the long suppressed religious feeling, that we cannot thoroughly struggle for the realization of the fraternal and loving paradise for the unfortunate and the oppressed?" So K'o-li-kai started to struggle to solemnly deal with the agitation of the heart, but it is not an ordinary and base heart, but a religious heart. This heart does not become cruel for the realization of poverty, but is a heart filled with the illusions of happiness.

He is like a preacher speaking for others, speaking for the poor people, to prove his "religious feelings." So as soon as he starts the struggle, he tells people that he himself does not need Communism, and his participation in the struggle is due to his selfless spirit of magnanimity, self sacrifice, and ambiguous significance, in the interests of "the poor, the unfortunate, and the oppressed." These people need his help. In a moment of desolation and melancholy, such a lofty feeling fills the heart of this good man, to become the panacea for the cure of all the evils of the world.

(Extract from Marx and Engels: "Oppose the Announcement of K'o-li-kai," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels Vol. IV, p. 15.)

The defects of the book by Fuerbach at the time also added to its influence. Beautiful, and sometimes excessively elaborate phrasology guaranteed for the book a large number of readers. At any rate, after the long years of rule by the abstract and difficult Hegelism, the people were given something fresh to read. The same may be said of the excessive mystification of love. Though such mystification of love cannot be defended, it can still be excused. This is because it is the reaction to the despotism exercised by the "pure thinking" which had become intolerable.

But we must not forget that "real socialism" exactly

hit on the weak point of Fuerbach. This "real socialism," like a contagious disease, spread among the "educated" people in Germany since 1844. It used beautiful phrases to replace scientific research. It does not use the method of reformed production in economy to liberate the proletariat, but advocates the reliance on "love" to liberate mankind. In a word, it has fallen into the depths of the most abhorrible phraseology and extensive empty talk.

(Extract from Engels: "Fuerbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 365.)

As to love! Really, in Fuerbach, love is always and everywhere a god that creates miracles who can assist in the overcoming of all difficulties in actual life. And this is a society divided into various classes with absolutely contradictory interests. In this way, the very last bit of revolutionary ~~idea~~ in his philosophy has disappeared. What is left is only an old tune: love one another, ~~know~~ know one another without distinction of sex and class. Drink together in harmony!

(Extract from Engels: "Fuerbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 382.)

"The fundamental point of departure for art and literature

is love, the love of mankind." Now love may serve as a point of departure but there is still a more basic one. Love is a concept, a product of objective practice. Fundamentally, we do not start from a concept but from objective practice. Our artists and writers who come from the intelligentsia love the proletariat because social life has made them feel that they share the same fate with the proletariat. We hate Japanese imperialism because the Japanese imperialists oppress us.

There is no love or hatred in the world that has not its cause. As to the so-called "love of mankind," there has been no such all-embracing love since humanity was divided into classes. All the ruling classes in the past liked to advocate it, and many so-called sages and wise men also did the same, but nobody has ever really practiced it, for it is impracticable in a class society.

Genuine love of mankind will be born only when class distinctions have been eliminated throughout the world. The classes have caused the division of society into many opposites and so soon as they are eliminated there will be love of all mankind, but not now. We cannot love our enemies, we cannot love social evils, and our aim to exterminate them. How can our artists and writers fail to understand such a common sense matter?

(Extract from Mao Tse-tung, "Address to the Literary

Forum at Yenan," see Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol.III, pp.32-33.)

V. Humanitarians Oppose the Class Theory with
Theory of Human Nature; Bourgeois Human Nature
Is Bourgeois Individualism

The socialist and Communist literatures of France were born under the oppression of the bourgeoisie which held the ruling position. They were a kind of expression in written language of the struggle against that rule. When such literature was moved to Germany, the bourgeois there had just started its struggle against the feudal despotic system.

The German philosophers, pseudo-philosophers, and the group of people who liked to talk big grabbed this literature avariciously. But they forgot that when the literature was transferred from France to Germany, the living conditions in France had not been transferred at the same time. Under the conditions in Germany, the French literature lost all its practical significance. It became merely a style in writing. It could not but become the expression of a senseless dream for the realization of human nature.

For example, in the eyes of the German philosophers of the 18th century, the demands of the first French Revolution was only a demand "for the realization of ideals" generally.

And in their eyes, the expression of the desires of the French revolutionary bourgeoisie merely signified the expression of the laws of pure desire, that is, normal desire, and real desire of mankind.

.....

In this way French socialist and Communist literature became broken up. Since in the hands of the Germans this literature could no longer express the struggle of one class against another, the Germans felt that they had overcome the "one-sided nature of the French," and they felt that they did not persist in the demand for facts, but that they were persisting in the demand for truth. They felt they were not representing the interests of the proletariat, but were representing the interests of human nature, that is, the interests of people in general, people who do not belong to any class, and basically do not exist in the realistic world, but are found only in the elusive space of the dreams of the philosophers.

(Extract from Marx and Engels, "Communist Manifesto"
see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV,
pp. 495-496.)

(4) The ideal of the Communist is like this: "He bears on his body the imprint of mankind (today to whom may we not say so?),⁽¹⁰⁾ ascertains his own objectives in accordance with

the objective of mankind (it seems that mankind is a person capable of having his own objectives.)⁽¹¹⁾ And just because he can contribute his all at present and in the future to mankind, so he strives to do everything for himself." (complete self-sacrifice and self debasement before the shadow of illusion.)

(5) The question of the relationship between the individual and mankind is expressed in the following bombastic and foolish words, "Like our individual activities, all of us are but symbols of the great movement born in the innermost part of mankind." Where is this "innermost part of mankind?" In this way, the concrete man is only the "symbol" and mark of the "movement" born in the "innermost part" of an illusory world.

(6) This village preacher has turned the struggle for the Communist society into "the quest for that great common spirit," so that this "great spirit" would "emit brilliantly colored rays in the sacrament cup" and like the "holy ghost," would "twinkle in the eyes of the faithful."

Since the Communist revolutionary movement has been thus transformed into the "quest" for the holy ghost and the holy sacraments, naturally K'o-li-kai can also say, "So long as we know" this spirit, we can use love to unite all the world.

(Extract from Marx and Engels: "Opposing the
Announcement of K'o-li-kai," see Complete Works
of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, pp. 12-13.)

If we start from such a religious view, then the replies to all practical questions can only be some religiously exaggerated forms which make any kind of significance vague, some beautiful terms like "all mankind," and "humanitarianism", and "human beings," This will turn all practical questions into illusory words.

(Extract from Marx and Engels: "Opposition to the Announcement of K'o-li-kai," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p. 17.)

A single individual may not "generally" change with the class to which he belongs, this is quite "possible." But this fact does not affect class struggle, just as the change of a few aristocrats into tiers etat cannot affect the French revolution. And it was at this time these aristocrats at least joined a specific class, the revolutionary class - the bourgeoisie. But Mr. Hai-en-ts'en must arbitrarily make all classes disappear in "human nature," this red-hot idea.

If Mr. Hai-en-ts'en holds that the economic conditions which do not change according to one's own desires to form the foundation of existence of the classes which are placed at antagonistic positions because of these conditions, and that these classes can exceed their realistic conditions for existence by relying on the "human nature" inherent in all the people, then

it will be so easy for a king to rely on his own "human nature" and exceed his own "regal authority," and exceed his "royal profession."

(Extract from Marx: "Moral Criticism and Critical Morals," see Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p.344.)

Speaking of the form, he is realistic, he makes man the starting point. But he never touches upon the world in which this man lives, and so this man of his is still the abstract man of religion and philosophy. This man does not seem to have been born out of the womb of his mother, but rather like the butterfly coming out of the chrysalis, flying out of the god of some religion. And so he does not live in realities, not in the world developed in history and affirmed in history. Though he has dealings with other men, but each one of them, like himself, is abstract. In his religion and philosophy, we still can find men and women. But in his ethics, even this difference has disappeared.

When a man only thinks for himself, only in very rare cases may he satisfy the desire of his quest for happiness, and this is far from being beneficial to both himself and others. A man must have relations with the outside world, and must have the means to satisfy his own needs: food, sex, books, con-

versation, debate, activities, consumption goods, and objectives of work:

One of the following two things must be true. Either the Feuerbachian morals postulates that each person undoubtedly possesses these means and objects. Or else this code of morals only provide some good, but impractical advices, so that it is not of any value to the people who do not possess the above means. On this point, Feuerbach himself frankly said, "What the people in the palace wants are different from that the people in the hut wants. If because of hunger and poverty you have no nutrition inside your body, then you will not have food for morals in your senses, your mind and your heart."

(Extract from Engels: "Feuerbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy," see Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, pp. 379-381.)

Feuerbach restores the nature of religion as the nature of man. However, the basic nature of man is not some abstract thing possessed by every individual body. From the realistic point of view, it is the sum total of all social relations.

Feuerbach does not criticize this realistic basic nature, and so he cannot but:

(1) Leave aside the progress of history, but observe solely *gemut* (religious feeling), and postulates the abstract

- isolated - human individual, and

(2) Accordingly, in his place, the physical character of man can only be understood as a "species", understood as a kind of internal and dumb commonness built up with many individual bodies relying solely on natural ties.

(Extract from Marx: "The Theories of Feuerbach" see
Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 403.)

The shameless members of the Liberal Group and the Democratic Group say hoarsely, "K'o-erh-tien is a man with education, with culture, talks of humanitarianism, and is magnanimous." They further hold themselves above any "parties," and are speaking from the viewpoint of "all mankind."

Respected sirs! You are mistaken, This is not the viewpoint of all mankind, but the viewpoint of the whole body of slaves. Slaves who realize their slave status and struggle against it are revolutionaries. Those who do not realize their slave status and live silently and patiently as slaves are one hundred percent slaves. And those who gratefully laud the beautiful life of slaves and feel endless thankful to their good and kind masters are servile slaves, shameless people. Gentlemen of the "Comrades Journal," you are truly such shameless people.

With your base and weak minds you are moved by that man

who is a counter revolutionary landlord and supports the counter revolutionary government, and calls him educated and humane. You do not understand that you are not turning a slave into a revolutionary, but only turning a common slave into a servile slave. You talk about freedom and democracy only to impress the masses and to curry favor. They are antiquated and superfluous tunes, fashionable empty talk, or hypocrisy. It is a mask that is not smartly made up. And you yourselves are hypocrites. Your souls are most base, all your upbringing, culture and education are only a kind of disguised prostitution. Because you have sold your souls, not because merely of poverty, but also of "love for art."

(Extract from Lenin: "In Memory of Count K'o-erh-tin"
see Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XIII, p. 36.)

You oppose the method of simply dividing mankind into rich men and poor men. Of course there is the middle class, and also there are the technical intellectuals you talk about, among them people of great sincerity. But among these intellectuals there are also insincere and very bad people. There are all kinds of people. But human society is first divided into the rich and the poor, the property class and the exploited. Leaving this basic contradiction between the rich and the poor and you leave the basic facts.

I do not deny the existence of the middle class. This

middle class either stands on one side or the other in the struggle between the two conflicting classes, or else it adopts a neutral or semi-neutral stand. However, let me repeat: to leave aside this basic division of society and the basic struggle between the two major basic classes is to obliterate facts. This struggle is being carried out at the moment, and will be continued. The result of this struggle will be decided by the proletariat, the class of the workers.

(Extract from "Stalin's Interview with the
British author Wells," pp. 8-9.)

"The Theory of human nature." Is there such a thing as human nature? Of course there is. But there is only human nature in the concrete, no human nature in the abstract. In a class society there is only human nature that bears the stamp of a class, but no human nature transcending classes. We uphold the human nature of the proletariat, of the great masses of the people, while the landlord and bourgeois classes uphold the human nature of their own classes as if - though they do not say so outright - it were the only kind of human nature. The human nature boosted by certain petty bourgeois intellectuals is also divorced from or opposed to that of the great masses of the people; what they call human nature is in substance nothing but bourgeois individualism and consequently in their eyes proletarian human nature is contrary to their humannature.

This is the "theory of human nature" held by some people in Yen-an as the so-called basis of their theory of art and literature, which is utterly mistaken.

(Extract from Mao Tse-tung: "Address to Forum on Art in Yen-an," see Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. III, p. 892.)

Notes:

- (1) Referring to bourgeois and petty bourgeois socialism of the time.
- (2) The Capuchin order is a branch of the Franciscans of the Catholic Church. "The Sermons of Capuchian priests" is filled with righteous teachings of the sect.
- (3) The nine goddesses of literature and art in Greek mythology.
- (4) One of the giants who fought with the gods at Olympus.
- (5) The hero of "Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp" in "Arabian Nights," who acquired a magic lamp and did many things.
- (6) Marx here refers to the illusionary Communism of the old age.
- (7) Cha-pei Ai-ti-yeh-na (1788-1856), French political commentator; representative of pacific Communism; T'e-sha-mi T'e-ao-to (1803-1850), French political commentator, representative of revolutionary sect of illusionary Communism.

nism; and Wei-t'e-lin Wei-lien (1808-1871), activist of early German labor movement, a theorist of illusionary Communism.

(8) Marx to Lu-k'o.

(9) Referring to bourgeois democratic revolution.

(10) and (11) Bracketed words are those of Marx and Engels.

GORKY AND LU HSUN ON HUMANITARIANISM
AND HUMAN NATURE

[The following is a full translation of an article entitled "Ko-erh-chi lu-shun lun jen-tao chu-i ho jen-hsing lun" (English version as above), appearing in Wen-i Pao (Literary Gazette) No. 9, Peiping, 11 May 1960, pp.18-26.]

(Wen-i Pao Editor's Comment.) In their own fighting lives, both Gorky and Lu Hsun had used their sharp pens to pierce through the hypocritical faces of the bourgeois humanitarianists and advocates of the theory of human nature. Gorky also expressed some very good views on the lofty contents of proletarian humanitarianism. Here we present for the reference of readers the major views of these two literary giants on humanitarianism and human nature.

SECTION ONE - ON HUMANITARIANISM

Statements by Gorky

In this age of ours, the so-called "humanitarianism" of the bourgeoisie, which is the hypocrisy of the culture of benevolent love, is completely, indisputably and most shamelessly exposed. All phenomena in the social world are created by the living acts of man. The forces of such acts are also exposing the anti-humanitarian significance of certain phenomena which

are covered up by the sweet words of the humanitarians and the so-called "laws." In this age of ours, only the idiot of the "swindler with the pen" will say that love and co-exist with selfishness - the foundation and "soul" of bourgeois society. Bourgeois "humanitarianism" is in effect nearly wholly expressed in the building of hospitals, which may be considered the plants for the repair of the human body. . . . The hospital does not show, and cannot show, that the bourgeoisie is concerned with the protection of the health of the working people, or its desire to create the conditions to prevent sickness among the working people, to prevent the waste of their energy and their premature death. Expenditure incurred in the treatment of people who have been broken up can be offset by income from the manufacture of medicines, instruments, and pills, and profit a hundred-fold can be made. Sickness is a source of wealth for the merchants.

(Extract from "Education on Reality.")

In the bourgeois society, talking of "love" is naturally naive and laughable. In the bourgeois society there is one law, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." This is to say that it is a basic rule for a person to love himself. As everybody knows clearly, if the bourgeois society obeys the laws of "not coveting" the neighbor's goods and "not killing" the neighbor, this

society cannot be established and cannot exist.

In the Soviet Union, even the children of the Young Pioneers also learn to understand and they do understand an ugly but clearly visible truth: the civilization and culture of the bourgeoisie are built on the ceaseless cruel plunder of an overwhelming majority and hunger and cold stricken "neighbors" by a small number of "neighbors" who have waxed rich.

When there are people who must plunder "neighbors", it is absolutely impossible to "love thy neighbors." If the neighbors resist such plunder, they will be killed. From the very earliest times, in the process of the development of the bourgeois "system", among the poor people hunger and cold stricken, pirates and highwaymen were born. But there were also born the humanitarians, and though they themselves were not well fed and fully clothed, nevertheless they proved the need to restrain selfishness before both the wealthy and the hunger and cold stricken.

(Extract from "On Socialist Realism.")

The state system of the capitalist class has divided people into the oppressors, the oppressed and the harmonizers who cannot harmonize. This has long been proved indisputably, and it is superfluous to speak of it again. Nevertheless, we have to speak of it again, because many youths are making haste to seek their comfortable places in life. Perhaps they do not

understand that such hasty confusion may bring them back to the old age, back to the circus of tragedy. On the stage in this circus, capitalist realism is exhibiting so shamelessly. In the circus the advocates of harmony and humanitarianism are playing the role of lyrical clowns.

(Extract from Reply.)

During the first half of the 19th century, aristocratic literary figures described the peasants - "sons of God" - as very pitiable. The good natured lyrical poets and the illusionaries who follow their own fate would persuade the government to believe truly that the peasants are also human beings. It was time that the shackles of slavery over their necks should be taken down - ^{The peasants must be taught to read.} the law of peasant slavery. /During the second half of the century, bourgeois intellectuals continued propaganda on this primitive humanitarianism. The peasants were painted with light and soft colors, such as Turgnev and Tolstoy painted them. It can be said that the aristocrats hoped that the peasants would be literate only in order to obtain more effective labor power, while the bourgeoisie would use this force to struggle against despotism.

(Extract from "On Old People and New People.")

People must be good and moderate. This advice has been offered for more than 2,000 years. The propaganda of humanitar-

ianism has long since revealed its complete ineffectiveness.

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."
This was what the Bible said. Mark Twain considered that this referred to the British capitalists, for they actually inherited the earth all over the world with blood and melancholy. So it will not do, better not talk about humanitarianism. There is capitalism, which is greatly concerned with the preparation of world-wide massacre. Moreover, "war breeds heroes," and "heroes adorn the human race."

Indeed, the war of 1914 to 1918 bred real war heroes, the speculators, "big people," "new riches," "giants," and "sharks" which so strangely adorned mankind. These people extracted great wealth from the sweat and blood of workers and peasants, and comfortably continued their control of the strength and will of the masses of workers. In order to further consolidate their state power, they organized "fascism," an antiquated, middle age like method of oppression against the workers. And the working class "humanely" tolerated all this, braving the danger of temporarily returning to the bloody darkness of the pattern of the Middle Ages.

(Extract from "Reply.")

After the war, the "humanitarianism" of the philistines remained like what it was before the war, being still lip service "benevolence" outside the realm of realities. This

humanitarianism could still feebly cry for the protection of individual nature, but was completely cold to the sufferings of the masses and their oppression. In a word, the terrible lesson of the war absolutely failed to change the mentality of the philistine stratum, such as this lesson failed to change the habits of mosquitoes, croaches and frogs.

(Extract from "Philistines.")

"The world is morbid." Not only the Bolsheviks affirm this, but humanitarians with a lyrical mind also affirm it. They finally understand that the two legged plunders attempt to exploit such feelings as "love, mercy, and magnanimity" to cover up their wolf-like "nature". Such feelings actually are not useful. They can hardly be turned into commodities, they cannot find consumers, and they adversely affect the increase of profits in industry and commerce.

"The world is mad." So cry loudly the capitalist state powers, irresponsible and devoid of human reason, that protect and preserve their rule of the workers' world, and so loudly cry the people who hold it their duty to safeguard their masters in the unlimited and barbarous exploitation of the energy of the workers.

The beginning of the history of the "malady" of capitalism nearly followed closely the seizure by the bourgeoisie

of state power from the feeble hands of the feudal lords. Friedrich Nietzsche, a contemporary of Karl Marx, may be considered the first person to pay attention to this malady and to cry after it in helplessness. There is nothing accidental, all living phenomena have their bases. When Marx was scientifically and indisputably explaining the natural destruction of capitalism, and the natural rise of the state power of the proletariat, in those years Nietzsche, with the wrath of a sick and fearful fanatic propagated the legality and unlimited nature of the state power of "chin fa shou". This was not accidental.

Before Nietzsche, Max Stirner⁽¹⁾ denied the bourgeois state, religion and morals, and further affirmed that the individual had unlimited rights to seek his own profit. In such denials of the anarchists, there was actually hidden the rejection of that "humanitarianism" which has already been created by the bourgeoisie in the Middle Ages, during its struggle against the feudal system and the church, against the ideological leadership of the feudal lords.

The bourgeoisie had long since understood the defects and contradictions of this "humanitarianism" in the daily practice of bourgeois living. The religious reformation of Luther and Calvin gave clear proof of this. The main point of the reformation was the replacement of the "humanitarian" Catechism by the Bible. This Bible not only considers that

racial disharmony, killing, plunder, deception and all such things are completely naturally, but also considers them worthy of praise. Without them, a bourgeois state cannot exist. ..

When the bourgeoisie created fascism, it discarded its own humanitarianism just as it discarded a mask which had been worn out and could no longer conceal its cunning beastly face. It had realized that humanitarianism was one reason for its split personality and corruption. This proves that the falsehood and hypocrisy of our bourgeois "humanitarianism" today are not necessary.

The facts stated above have proved that each time the sensitive people are alarmed over the undesirable conditions of the world, and propagate universal love, naively attempting to ease the bad situation or to use argumentative words to cover them up, the masters of life and the small merchants only tolerate such propaganda in the attempt to calm the people roused to indignation by poverty and lawless persecution, and other unavoidable results from the "cultural" activities of the small merchants all over the world. But when the wrath of the masses of workers shows signs of a socialist revolution, the bourgeoisie will use "reactionary methods to deal with such activities."

(Extract from "Proletarian Humanitarianism.")

Are the so-called humanitarians strange people? The incidents in India, China, and Palestine have not moved them in the least. The incidents within their own countries likewise have not moved them. They are cool toward the development of animal type capacities, such as nationalism, anti-Judaism, and the boycott of foreign countries. They are also cool toward the almost daily enacted dramas and tragedies in the antiquated and blood-stained structures of the bourgeois countries. They did not want to protest the base acts of Raymond Poincaré.⁽²⁾ This man seemed to have sent France to her doom, but now he is again striving to plan the new massacre of workers and peasants.

However, whatever the reason, in the whole world, the humanitarians and the "protectors of human rights" only pay attention to one locality, and that is the locality of the Soviet Socialist Union.

Messrs. Humanitarians, take a look. What is it that arouses fears among private property owners? Wherein lies the reason for the hatred of the Soviet Union, the slander of the state power of the workers and peasants and its living conditions, and the slander of its masses? The mysterious energy of this people has paved the way to a new age for the revival of all humanity. Messrs. Humanitarians! Please allow me to bring up the following naive question:

Why is it that you do not protest against the system of

PAGES 155/156

ARE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL
DOCUMENT

the working class itself are completely incompatible with the ideological system of all phases of the humanitarianism that is antiquated, poor, and lacking in will power.

(Extract from "The Working Class Should Foster
Its Own Cultural Leaders.")

Real humanitarianism can only be proletarian humanitarianism, which has established before itself a great goal: the transformation of all the foundations of the economic life of this world. In a country where the proletariat has grasped the state power, we can see that the proletariat possesses in its own masses colossal power for the development of great capacity to rapidly transform the modes of living and instill new contents in them.

(Extract from "To Meeting for the Protection of
Culture.")

Apart from the word humanitarianism, these two kinds of humanitarianism (original editor's note: proletarian humanitarianism and bourgeois humanitarianism) have nothing in common between them. The word is the same, but the real contents are drastically different. The humanitarianism born 500 years ago had been a means of self defense used by the bourgeoisie against the feudal lords and the church. This church was the spiritual leader of the bourgeoisie, but it was led by the feudal

lords. When equality of man was discussed, the rich capitalists - industrialists and merchants - only referred to equality between themselves and the feudal lords, those parasites who donned the armor of knights or the white robes of bishops.

Bourgeois humanitarianism lived harmoniously together with the slave state, the slave traffic, "the first night right," the religious tribunal of the church, the "A-pi-erh sect" that slaughtered "Tu-lu-sou", the burning at the stake of Giordano Bruno, John Huss and thousands upon thousands of heretics, "witches," artisans and peasants. These people were affected by the reaction of primitive Communism to the Bible and the Gospels.

Had the bourgeoisie ever resisted the barbarous acts of the church and the feudal lords? As a class it never did. Individual capitalists did resist, but the bourgeoisie eliminated them. In the past, bourgeois humanitarians had enthusiastically helped the feudal lords in the suppression of the peasant army of Wat Tyler (original editor's note: an armed insurrection of peasants in the south of England in 1381), the French "peasants' insurrection" and the "Ta-pu-lieh religious sect." All this was just as cruel and merciless as the educated merchants of the 20th century suppressed the workers in Vienna, "An-t'e-wei-pu," Berlin, Spain, the Philippines, India and China.

Do we want to talk about these crimes most bestial in character? These crimes are known to all, and they have proved that "humanitarianism which is the foundation of bourgeois culture" has been deleted from our lives today. It is no longer brought up, perhaps because it has finally been appreciated that it is too shameful to talk about humanitarianism at a time when nearly everyday the hungry workers on the streets of cities are being slaughtered, made to fill up the prisons, having the most active of them executed, and thousands upon thousands of them are sent away for hard labor.

In a word, apart from the giving of such alms as impaired the dignity of the workers, the bourgeoisie never exerted effort to lighten the work of the working masses. In practice, the humanitarianism of the bourgeoisie has been displayed as "universal love", that is, a kind of alms to the people who had been robbed. They discovered and universally welcomed the most foolish and deceptive commandment, "Do not let your right hand know what your left hand is doing." And so when the masters of life had plundered millions and billions worth of booty, they would donate a few coppers for the operation of schools, hospitals and homes for the disabled. The small citizenry in its works propagated the "bounty toward the fallen", but the fallen were those people who had been robbed, thrown down and insulted by the merchants.

If bourgeois humanitarianism is righteous, if it sincerely hopes to rouse and foster the sense of human dignity in the hearts of the enslaved people and the self consciousness for their collective strength (the self consciousness of an individual for his own significance as an organizer of the world and the forces of nature), then this humanitarianism will not rouse the passive feeling of pity, but will foster positive hatred for all suffering, particularly the sufferings caused by social and economic reasons.

Physiological suffering is nothing but the mark caused when the organic body of man has been invaded by a kind of harmful element in the course of normal activities. The organic body uses the voice of suffering, "Man, protect yourself." When bourgeois humanitarianism propagates pity, it wants us to compromise with the suffering of humiliation, which appears to be caused by the unavoidable and ever fated class relations which basely divide people into high class and low class races, into white aristocrats and colored slaves. Such distinction will impede the working people's awakening to the unanimity of their interests and the reason for such distinctions.

Revolutionary proletarian humanitarianism marches forward courageously. It does not utter loud and sweet words about loving neighbors. Its goal is to liberate the proletariat of the whole world from the shameful, blood-stained and ferocious

oppression of the capitalists. It teaches people not to treat themselves as commodities for sale, not to treat themselves as raw materials for the manufacture of the gold and luxury items of the capitalists.

Capitalism rapes the world just as an old man rapes a young and healthy woman, for apart from the diseases of old age, he cannot give her anything that will bear fruit. Proletarian humanitarianism does not need lyrical discussions of love. What it needs is to make each worker realize his historical mission, his right to government, and his revolutionary activities, particularly when the capitalists want to launch a new war against him.

Proletarian humanitarianism needs the indelible hatred for the capitalists and their servants, parasites, fascists, executioners, and rebels of the working class, and the state power of these elements. It needs the hatred for all that causes suffering, and for those who live on the sufferings of millions upon millions of the people. I think that for the true facts briefly outlined here, every righteous person will see clearly the value of bourgeois culture and that of proletarian culture.

(Extract from "On Culture.")

In our age today, before the state power stands toweringly proletarian humanitarianism, created historically and

scientifically by Marx, Lenin and Stalin, true and belonging to all humanity. The goal of this humanitarianism is to liberate completely from the iron fists of capitalism the working people of all races and all nations. This real doctrine of universal love indisputably proves that the iron fists of capital are created by the workers. The proletariat creates "beautiful life" for capitalism, and the people themselves become beggars deprived of rights.

This revolutionary humanitarianism bestows on the proletariat historical and singular rights to wage a merciless struggle against capitalism, to destroy and eliminate all the ugliest foundations of the bourgeois world. In the entire history of mankind, real universal love for the first time is treated as a creative force and is organized. Its goal is to liberate millions upon millions of the working people from the minority of inhuman and ignorant state powers. It points out to millions upon millions of physical laborers that such labor has precisely created all culture and wealth. It also relies on them, the proletariat, to create the socialist culture that is new and embraces all mankind, a culture which will firmly establish on earth the fraternal love and equality of the working people.

This humanitarianism of the proletariat is not a kind of illusion, not a kind of theory, but it is the combative, courageous and heroic practice of the proletariat of the so-

cialist Soviet Union. This practice has already proved that in Russia which had been bourgeois, brutal, barbarous and multi-racial, there has been truly realized racial fraternity and equality, and really and indisputably developed the process of the transformation of the gigantic forces of physical labor into the forces of mental labor.

(Extract from "Proletarian Humanitarianism.")

To the proletariat, the individual is precious. Even when a person has revealed the tendency to be harmful to society, and at a certain stage has actually perpetrated acts harmful to society, he would not be allowed to rot in the prison, but would be re-educated into a skilled worker, a useful member of society. This firm attitude toward "criminals" explains the positive humanitarianism of the proletariat, which had never been produced anywhere, and cannot exist in a society where "man treats man as a wolf."

(Extract from "On Culture.")

Statements by Lu Hsiang

In a word, whether or not a dog that has fallen into the water should be beaten up first depends on the attitude it adopts after it has crawled ashore.

The nature of a dog is generally not much changed. Possibly 10,000 years later, things will be different from

today. But now we are talking of the present. If we say that after having fallen into water, the dog becomes very pitiable, then there are so many creatures which harm people but are also pitiable. Even cholera germs, in spite of their rapid growth, are very frank in character. But the doctor will definitely not let them go.

Today the bureaucrats and the gentry, or the foreign gentry, on seeing anybody who is not to their own liking, will label him bolshevik, Communist. Before the founding of the republic, the condition was a little different. First the undesirable was labelled a member of the Kang clique, and later labelled a member of the revolutionary party. They even entered the imperial palace to make a secret report, and while this on the one hand was intended to preserve their own respect and honor, there was also the intention to "use another man's blood to redden their own caps." [to win a decoration.]

Nevertheless, the revolution finally did come to pass. The group of pompous gentry, like dogs who lost their master, coiled their queues over their heads. But the revolutionaries displayed a magnanimous disposition, which the gentry originally so greatly hated, and were truly "civilized." They said, we are all turning a new leaf, we do not beat up dogs that have fallen into the water, so let them crawl ashore. And so the gentry crawled ashore. By the second half of the second year

when the second revolution was staged, these gentry once more emerged into prominence to help Yuan Shih-k'ai to get rid of many revolutionaries. China again was plunged into darkness, deeper with each passing day. Up to now, not to mention of the older generation left over from the former dynasty, but there are also many younger people left over from the former dynasty. This is because our martyrs were too benevolent, and were compassionate toward the evil ones who grew into prominence. And the young member of the later age who knows all this have had to spend greater energy and sacrifice more lives in their resistance against darkness.

(Extract from "Fei-eh-fu-la Should Proceed Slowly", in the collection "Fen".)

Let us for the moment put aside the great sayings of the gentry who were full of the "women's truths" in their hearts and full of the "men's truths" in their mouths. Even the great common truths so loudly acclaimed by people with good intentions, in China today, not only will fail to help the good people, but may even protect the bad people. Because the bad people are in power, and the good people are maltreated. At such a time, even if people shout loudly about justice, it will not be listened to. The shouting remains shouting, and the good people continue to suffer.

But once in a while, the good people may rouse

themselves slightly, and the bad people should have fallen into the water. However, those who really advocate justice will come out with their shouts, "Do not retaliate," "be benevolent," and "do not resist evil with evil." And this time their words really produce effect, and they are no longer shouting futilely. The good people listen to them, and the bad people are saved.

After they are saved, the bad people only feel themselves lucky, and will never repent. And moreover they have long since prepared three dens to take refuge in, and are artful. So in a little while, they once more hold sway, and repeat their evil acts as before. At this time those who clamor for justice will no doubt again speak out, but they are not listened to.

However, let us look at the "ch'ing liu" group in the Han dynasty, and the "tung lin" group of the Ming dynasty. They "hated evil too seriously," and "were excessive in their corrective measures." And this ultimately caused their downfall. Critics are wont to take them to task for this. But they must realize that "the other side" likewise "hated evil seriously" and nobody criticized them. If in the future, light and darkness will still fail to carry out a thorough struggle, and honest people will use "magnanimity" instead of "suppression of the evil," and continue to be tolerant to the end, then the present state of confusion will never end.

(Extract from "Fei-eh-fu-la Should Proceed

Slowly," in the collection "Fen.")

This play has brought Quixote on the stage, and very clearly pointed out the defects of Quixot-ism, even its harm. In Act I, he uses strategem and his own suffering to rescue the revolutionary, and is spiritually victorious. But in effect he is also victorious, for the revolution finally comes off and the despot is thrown into prison. But at this time this humanitarian suddenly holds that the dukes are the oppressed, and releases them so that they again cause harm. Their arson and plunder cause damage greater than the sacrifices in the revolution. Though he does not enjoy the confidence of people, not even that of his servant, Sancho, he is often exploited by the bad people, to help in making the world remain in darkness.

.....

The book was originally published in 1922, six years after the October Revolution. The world was full of all kinds of rumors which did their best to harm the revolution, and these extolled the spiritual, expressed love for freedom, upheld humanitarianism, and generally showed dissatisfaction with the arrogance of the revolutionary party, holding that the revolution would not only fail to revive the world, but would rather bring in hell instead.

Quixote was thus the joint product of the many thinkers

and writers who disparaged the October Revolution. Among them were naturally Mereshkovsky, and Tolstoyists. There were also Romain Rolland and Einstein. I even suspect that Gorky was also included, for at the time he was working for such people, helping them to leave their country and settling down, and it was even said that for this he came into conflict with the authorities.

But such explanations and conjectures would not necessarily be believed by the people. For they held that when there is a one-party dictatorship, there must be writings in defense of the despotic rule, and that however artful they are written, they only provide a cover for the blood stains. But the few intellectuals saved by Gorky proved the accuracy of this conjecture. As soon as they left their country, they castigated Gorky, just like the resurrected Count "Mo-erh-ch'ueh".

(Extract from "Postscript to Liberated Quixote",
in the collection "Chi-wai-chi shih-i.")

SECTION II - ON THE THEORY OF HUMAN NATURE

Statement by Gorky

Writers are the eyes, ears and voices of the class. There are writers who do not recognize this, and reject this from their hearts. However, a writer is ever unavoidably an organ of his class, a sensitive organ of his class. He receives the atmosphere, hope, unrest, desire, enthusiasm, concern,

good traits and defects of his own class and group. In its development, he himself is restricted by all these things. He has never been an "inherently free person," or "a general person" and he cannot be so.

As to the man who is completely free, "not restricted by anything," the so-called man of mankind, he can only exist when the national, class, religious thoughts and feelings with their fierce oppressive forces no longer obstruct the free growth of his strength and his talent, an age in the future.

(Extract from "On Realities.")

Statements by Lu Hsiang

When the professors of Shanghai talk to people about literature, they make out that literature must describe human nature that is permanently unchanging, for otherwise it will not last. They cite the example of England where Shakespeare and one or two others have written about human nature that is permanently unchanging, and so their works are still in circulation. The others did not do so, and they are gone.

This is precisely what is meant by the words, "If you do not explain, I understand it all right. But when you explain, I get all confused." I think among the writings of the many early authors of England, some must have ceased to be circulated. But I never realized that their lapse has been due to the fact that they did not write about human na-

ture of a permanent character. Now that I understand this, I am further confused because since they have passed out, how can our present professors see them, and directly judge that they had written things which are not the human nature that is permanently unchanging.

.....

However, is human nature permanently unchanging?

The man-like ape, the ape-like man, primitive man, the ancient man, the present man, and the future man ... if living creatures really go through the process of evolution, then human nature cannot be permanently unchanging. Let us not talk about the ape-like man. But even in the case of the primitive man, we can hardly guess his temperament. And people in the future may not likely understand our own temperament. It is truly difficult to write about human nature that is permanently unchanging.

Let us take sweating for example. I think this seems to be found since ancient days and is certainly found today. It will be found in the future, at least temporarily. It may thus be considered something "permanent of the pattern of human nature." However, there is the "fragrant sweat" from the young miss so fragile that she cannot stand in the wind. And there is the "smelly sweat" from the worker "clumsy as an ox." No, if we want to write something that will endure in

prosperity, if we are to be a literary figure who will live for ever, are we to describe the fragrant kind of sweat, or are we to describe the smelly kind of sweat? If we do not solve this question first, then our place in the future history of literature will be "precarious."

We hear that in England, the novels were originally intended for the ladies and the misses, and naturally there must be more fragrant sweat in them. But by the second half of the 19th century, under the influence of Russian literature, some smelly sweat had also come into the writings. Which of the two kinds will have a longer life? Perhaps we do not know it yet.

In China, listening to a Taoist priest preaching the way of life, and discussing literature with the critics, people have their pores stiffened and they dare not sweat. But this is perhaps the Chinese type of human nature that is permanently unchanging.

(Extract from "Literature and Sweat", in the collection
"Erh-i Chi.")

Mr. Liang first holds that the mistake of the proletarian literary theory is "to impose class restrictions on literature," because a capitalist and a worker have their differences but they also have their similarities. "There is no difference in their human nature (these two words were originally put un-

der quotation marks)", such as the fact that they both have the feelings of joy, anger, remorse and happiness, and they both have love (but this "refers to love itself, not the form of love"), And "literature is the art which represents the most basic human nature."

These words are contradictory and empty. Since civilization has property for its foundation, and the poor people are "making good" if they exert their utmost to climb up. In such a case, climbing up is the essence of life, the wealthy are the highest positions in mankind, and literature will only have to represent the bourgeoisie. Why should it bother to be so "effusive in sympathy," as to include the "inferior" proletariat? And how is the "self" of "human nature" to be represented?

The chemical nature of an element or a mixed element has the capacity to be compounded, and the physical nature has hardness. To show this capacity and this strength, two kinds of matter must be used. If we want to dispense with matter and seek to represent the capacity for compounding and hardness in itself, there is yet no such good method. But once matter is used, the phenomenon will be different according to the matter used. Without resorting to the use of people, literature will not be able to reveal "character." And once we resort to the use of personalities, and particularly those of a class society, we definitely cannot get away from their class character.

and this comes naturally, without the need for the imposition of restrictions.

Of course, joy, anger, remorse and happiness are the natural feelings of man. But the poor man definitely does not have to worry over an exchange suffering a loss. Nor does the oil king appreciate the sufferings of the old woman in Peking picking up coal dregs for a living. The refugees in hunger stricken areas will generally have no time for the cultivation of orchids like the old gentlemen of the great families. Chiao Tai, the servant in the Chia Mansion, will certainly not make love to Sister Lin. It is certainly no proletarian literature to merely shout "Whistle" and "Lenin." Nor can we call literature that expresses the "self" of "human nature" such writings as "O, everything!" "O, all people!" and "Happy tidings are here, rejoice, o, people!"

If we place on the highest plane literature which reveals the most common human nature, then we must place on an even higher plane literature which reveals the most universal animal characters - nutrition, breathing, sports and progenition, perhaps eliminating sports - and literature which reveals the most universal biological characteristics. If you say that since we are human, let us limit ourselves to human nature, then because the proletarian is the proletariat, so their literature is proletarian literature.

(Extract from "Straight Translation," and "The Class Character of Literature," in the collection "Erh-hein-chi.")

A man lives in a class society and wants to be a "supra-class" writer. He lives in the fighting age and wants to live independently away from the struggle. He lives in the present and wants to write for the future. Such a man is only a shadow created in the mind. He does not exist in the real world. A man with such objectives is like one who uses his own hands to pull his head, to get himself off the earth. He cannot get away from it, and becomes agitated. But this is not because there are people who shake their heads so that he dares not pull further.

(Extract from "The Third Kind of People" in the collection "Nan-ch'iang pei-tiao chi.")

- (1) Max Stirner (1806-1856), German idealist philosopher. He was one of the representative figures of the "Young Hegelian School", and a petty bourgeois anarchist thinker.
- (2) Raymond Poincare (1860-1934), French bourgeois politician, was French President 1913-1920.

ON THE ARTISTIC VITALITY OF THE CLASSIC WORKS
AND THE SO-CALLED "UNIVERSAL HUMAN NATURE"

[The following is a full translation of an article entitled "T'an ku-tien tso-pin ti i-shu sheng-ming-li yu so-wei p'u-p'ien jen-hsing" (English version as above) by Liao Chung-an and others, carried in Wen-i Pao (Literary Gazette), No. 11, Peiping, 11 June 1960, pp. 10-18.]

I

The great literary classics possess artistic vitality that stands the test of time. The first great Chinese poet Chu Yuan left us more than two thousand years ago. But in 1953 the progressive elements of the world still held a meeting to commemorate him. The people of many countries still read his "Li Sao" and "Chiu-ko." Shakespeare left us between 300 and 400 years ago. But his plays are still regularly staged in the state theaters of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Such artistic vitality which has withstood the test of time has become a prominent mark as to whether a classical work is great.

Every great classical work is the product of a specific historical age, and reflects the face of social life of a specific historical age. This goes without saying. However, why is it that though the age producing the great work has passed, yet the work still retains its artistic magic in rousing the

feelings of the people? This is a question which has not yet been systematically studied and discussed in our literary theory. At a time when we are developing the thorough criticism of the literary viewpoint of revisionism and the bourgeois theory of human nature, the solution of this question has clearly become very urgently needed.

As we all know, for a long time the bourgeois literary and art circles have propagated the theory that the great classics possess "permanent magic power" because these works reflect the "universal human nature," "universal feelings," and "permanent themes" based on "universal human nature" and "universal feelings." Various types and patterns of revisionist literary theorists, used to repeating the sayings of the bourgeoisie, have also propagated the same viewpoint. In his "Articles Discussing Literature," Pa Jen has propagated openly, "These things inherent in artistic works which can rouse the people of different social classes through the ages are the things which share the common characteristics of mankind in general." (Articles Discussing Literature, p.317.)

How are we to understand the artistic vitality of the classics which have withstood the test of time? Why is the revisionist viewpoint referred to above mistaken? How was the artistic vitality of the classics created?

II

"There is no abstract truth. Truth is concrete." If we accept as a truth that the artistic vitality of the classics has withstood the test of time, we must recognize it in a concrete analysis. Is it true that a great classical work can produce magical power in different ages and over people of different classes with different viewpoints? Or we may ask, is it true that in different ages, people of different classes with different viewpoints hold a completely identical attitude toward the same great author?

If we do not analyze this question concretely, then the general conception on the vitality of art will to be forever be an abstract conception. Bourgeois literary and art circles and revisionist literary and art circles will precisely exploit this point to lead us into the fog of the theory of unknown, and thus make us accept their viewpoint of the theory of human nature.

In discussing modern revolutionary art, Mr. Lu Hsun said, "Art today generally is belittled, coldly received and persecuted on the one hand, and is sympathized with, endorsed and supported on the other hand." (Complete Works of Lu Hsun, Vol. IV, p. 242.) As a matter of fact, innumerable facts in the history of literature in China and foreign countries also show that the

great classical works and great classical authors who had penetratingly exposed social contradictions and possessed clear cut advanced ideological trends likewise "received belittlement, coolness and persecution on the one hand, and obtained sympathy, endorsement and support on the other hand." Or else, at certain times they received belittlement, coolness and persecution, while at other times they had sympathy, endorsement and support.

Here we wish merely to list some facts.

In Chinese classical literature, the two earliest classical works "Shih Ch'ing" (Odes) and "Chu Tzu" (Chu Yuan's poems) - sometimes referred to as the Feng and the Sao respectively - may be considered the most authoritative works. However, the "300 odes" was from the very beginning raised by the ruling class of Han Dynasty as a "scripture", and they were all processed by the four families of masters of the scripture, Chi, Lu, Han and Mao, who distorted their ideological content, and turned the collection into a textbook which propagated feudal ethics in compliance with the needs of the ruling class. Such mutilation and distortion may be considered one form of the "persecution" of a great classical work.

As to Chu Yuan's great poem, Li Sao, though it received the high praise of the great historian Ssu-ma Chien who hailed it as "capable of vying with the sun and the moon for luster," yet in the hands of the historian who was preserving a feudal

rule, Pan Ku, Chu Yuan was condemned as one whose works "displayed talent in order to praise his own ego," thus thoroughly rejecting the combat spirit of this great work.

Shih Ch'ing and Chu Tzu met such fates, and likewise, the great historical work "Shih Chi", the poems of Tu Fu, and the novels "Shui Hu" [All Men Are Brothers] "Hung Lou Meng" [Red Chamber Dream] and other works met such fates.

The great classical authors and their works in foreign countries were no exception. Shakespeare who died early in the 17th century was still not a universally known author during that century, and it was not until toward the end of the 17th century that his prestige gradually grew. The cold shoulder shown Shakespeare at the same time reflected the cold shoulder shown his works. Precisely because over a long time he was coolly received and neglected, biographical data on him became lost, and later many bourgeois scholars, the so-called students of Shakespeare, even cast doubts on his genuine authorship. This leads us to think about the joke about Liao Chi-p'ing, Hu Shih-chih and the like, who doubted the existence of the poet Chu Yuan.

Near our age we have Lev Tolstoy, who came from the family of an aristocratic landlord and who was a writer who enjoyed fame from the beginning. When suddenly he issued his

sharp and merciless protest against the Church, breaking away from all the traditional viewpoints of his own class, all the religious councils controlled by the czarist government immediately expelled him, and all the people in the upper strata of society came out to attack him. After Tolstoy died, the czarist government and the bourgeois newspapers of the liberal groups on the one hand mourned him with crocodile tears, and on the other hand did their best to distort him. On this point, Lenin in his article on Tolstoy had discussed thoroughly.

There is no need for us to list more examples. The great classical authors and great classical works that penetratingly exposed social contradictions and possessed clear cut advanced ideological trends were all continually slighted, coolly received, distorted and persecuted, and at the same time they were continually sympathized with, endorsed and supported and thus gained immortality. Such great classical works definitely cannot "rouse the people of all classes throughout the ages."

The reason is very clear. Chairman Mao has told us that in history there do not exist standards of literary criticism which are abstract and absolutely unchangeable, not only no political standards abstract and unchangeable, but also no artistic standards abstract and unchangeable. "The different class societies and different classes have different political standards and different artistic standards." "In any class society,

and in any class, political standards always come first and artistic standards come second." (Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung Vol. III, p. 371.)

Bourgeois literary and art circles and revisionists abstractly propagate the artistic vitality of classical works, and conceal these contradictory and complex historical facts. But Chairman Mao's directives on the standards of literary criticism penetratingly analyze these contradictory and complex historical facts, and point out the basic causes leading to such facts.

The artistic vitality of classical works is generally revealed through the continual combination of the standards of literary criticism of different ages and different classes. The different stages in history, the classical works of the past they inherited and those they opposed all have concrete content. Accordingly, there is no such secret as the abstract artistic vitality in the history of literature.

Of course, just this analysis is not sufficient answer to the question as to why great classical works possess the artistic vitality that can withstand the test of time. However, only by clearing the mist of the abstract general concept on the artistic vitality, and reaching a more correct concrete understanding of the concept may we discuss the question with a direct approach.

III

From the words of Pa Jen quoted above, we already know that he holds that classical works possess a lasting artistic vitality because in these works there are "the things which have the common characteristics of mankind in general." What do these things refer to concretely? He says, "The quest after love, lingering over mother love, joy of living, horror of death, longing for happiness, respect for heroic deeds all these are common to mankind." (Same book as quoted, p.94) All these are the manifestations of "human nature" according to Pa Jen.

He also gives some instances from classical works. The old man depicted by Balzac, for example, "has manifested the lofty character of mankind" (Ibid p.430.) And the respect people have for Pi Kan and the assassins of the period of the Warring States because they reveal manly courage and acts of knight-errantry, lofty things respect by mankind in common. He attempts to use these examples to prove his theory of human nature.

These statements of Pa Jen fully prove that he is a smuggler of the theory of human nature of bourgeois literary and art circles. The class trade marks he fixes on the goods he is vending only further prove the basic character of his "smuggling."

According to the viewpoint of bourgeois literary and art circles, universally common human nature exists among mankind from the first. Accordingly, people share a kind of common and universal feeling in matters such as love of the sexes, love between parent and child, and in life and death. Reflected in literary and artistic works, there are naturally "permanent themes" which depict universal human nature, universal human feelings. Love, death for example, constitute permanent themes which permeate literary works from olden times to the present. However human society may have developed, these themes will not change. An author has to manifest such permanent themes if his works are to draw response from the universal feelings of different readers in different ages, and thus possess the artistic vitality which make them immortal. In our criticism of Fa Jen, we have also to criticize this viewpoint at the same time.

We shall not touch now on the great changes these so-called "permanent themes" have gone through in proletarian socialist literature. On this point, in this articles such as "Talks on Poets," and "Conversation with Young Authors", Gorky has already dwelt with it penetratingly. Here we merely wish to observe classical literature, and see whether it is true that classical works will possess the so-called "permanent magic power" with the manifestation of "universal human nature"

and "permanent themes."

Works portraying the love between the sexes occupy an important place in both Chinese and foreign classical literature. This is a fact seen by all. In Chinese classical literature, beginning with the 15 "kuo feng" in the Odes and the "chiu ko" in Chu Tzu, practically the works of the common folk and the works of intellectuals in all ages include many which depict love, and some of them actually still possess artistic magic power to this day.

In Western literature, just as Engels said, "As to sexual love, it has in the last 800 years achieved such a great significance and such a lofty position that it has become the pivot around which all poetry and songs turn." (Selected Works of Marx and Engels, two-volume edition, Vol. II, p. 376.)

Let us, then, take a look to see whether the love of this so-called "permanent theme" has manifested the "universal human nature" which Pa Jen has described.

Goethe's Die Leiden des Jungen Werthers is a work which has been exceptionally extolled by those people who loudly sing the theory of permanent themes. In the seventies of the 18th century, this book was a sensation, and among young men and young women, this book was especially enthusiastically received. Goethe wrote for this book an introductory poem:

"What young man is not drunk with love?

What young woman is not infatuated with spring?

It is the purest of human feelings,

Why, then, should tragedy creep... in?"

This seems to be also the kind of introductory note that is most appealing to readers. However, the part in this book that is most moving lies precisely in its description of the tragedy that creeps into love, and the reason for this infiltration is not to be found in love itself. To use Goethe's words: the tragedy of Werthers reveals "obstructed happiness, hampered activities." (See Conversations of Goethe, Commercial Press, 1937 edition, p.37.)

What "obstructed" and "hampered" Werthers was precisely the backward feudal system which existed in Germany at the time. To oppose this system, the seventies of the 18th century in Germany saw the rise of a "mad movement." It was a great age in the development of literature in Germany. Just as Engels said, "In this age, each masterpiece was filled with the spirit of revolt against the entire German society at the time." (Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 634.) And Die Leiden des Jungen Werthers was an outstanding product that revealed the spirit of revolt of the age.

The advocates of the theory of human nature intentionally

close their eyes to these historical and class social contents, and just dreamily repeat "universal nature of mankind," and "permanent themes." Their dejected mentality can be readily recognized.

In his article criticizing Cha-erh Ko-lu-en's book, Goethe from the Viewpoint of Man, Engels had a very illuminating passage:

"The credit for the discovery of the man in Goethe has very well fallen on Mr. Ko-Lu-en. But this is not the man born out of a man and a woman, the natural, vigorous, man with blood and flesh. It is man on a higher level, a dialectic man, a man extracted from the dregs of the crucible of the holy father, the holy son and the holy ghost, the cousin of Ho-meng-k'o-lo-ssu in Faust. In a word, he is not the man described by Goethe, but the "man" described by Mr. Ko-lu-en."

(Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on Literature, 1959 edition, p. 34.)

This Mr. Ko-lu-en criticized by Engels can be considered the senior of Pa Jen, the modern advocate of the theory of human nature. The words of Engels can be wholly applied to Pa Jen. In the Chinese and foreign classical works of renown with rich social content, he only sees something which does not exist,

"things with the common characteristics of mankind in general."

Is not this a great merit?

Let us leave the scope of classical literature and say a few words. Pa Jen, the propagator of abstract human nature, in his article "On Human Feelings," openly attacked our modern literary works, saying that we can only write about class character, do not understand human nature and human feelings, so that our works are dry and tasteless.

After reading the above words of Engels, we have reason to bring up this theoretical question: Does the description of concrete human nature (class character) possess greater magic power, or the description of abstract human nature possess greater magic power? It is clear that if we are to describe people in accordance with Pa Jen's theory of the abstract human nature, we can only produce a type that is "the cousin of Ho-meng-k'olo-ssu."

However, if we merely look at Pa Jen's "theory of human nature" as an abstract theory, we shall be too naive. The abstract human nature he propagates is not abstract in content. Beneath the cloak of his abstract human nature lies the concrete human nature of bourgeois individualism which we have already seriously damaged. In his eyes, only this concrete human nature is the sole human nature.

Accordingly, he considers that proletarian human nature is not human nature. Proletarian human feelings have become "feelings that do not work." This is not our conclusion, for he himself says, "I do not like very much to read certain works of Socialist realism, and feel that the heroic figures therein can only be eyed at a distance but cannot be approached." (Tsun-ming-chi, p. 127.) Of course this is only a bit of his limited confession. Actually deep down in his soul, he not only "does not greatly like to read" these heroic figures, but also is very much opposed to them.

We must now return to our original theme. It is the question of the frequent use of the theme of love in well known Chinese and foreign classics, whether they are poems, novels or plays. However, in the well known classical works of all times (with the exception of fragmentary lyrics describing love in life), the significance of the love incidents does not lie in love itself, but rather in the rich content of social relationships penetratingly revealed through the love stories.

This is true of the Chinese works: The Peacock Flies Southeast, Western Chamber, Red Chamber Dream, and Story of the White Snake; and of such foreign works as Romeo and Juliet, Camelia, Anna Karenina and so forth. It is even true of the works Song of Everlasting Grief, Poetry Pavilion, and Tragedy

of Liang Shan-po and Chu-Ying-tai.

If an author wrote about love in an isolated manner, he definitely would not have won the praise of millions upon millions of readers of later ages. These penetrating and rich contents on social relationships can completely be understood and analyzed with the class viewpoint. To be divorced from these penetrating and rich contents of social classes, and speak of love as "universal human nature" and "permanent theme," we only have left a general concept of the capacity for sexual love among mankind, an empty thing.

Love between parents and children, like sexual love, has for its foundation human capability. But in the description of parent-children relationships which are truly moving, literary works definitely cannot stop at the relationship of blood relations in biology, but must mainly describe the penetrating and rich content of social relationships reflected in parent-children relationships. Like the abstract sexual relationship, the abstract relationship between parent and child is also empty and devoid of significance.

Let us take the example of the old man in Balzac's story. Pere Goriot became a merchant and rich, and distributed his wealth among his married daughters. As a result, the daughters after getting his money did not treat him as their father.

Throughout his life Goriot slaved for his children, and even on his death bed he could not forget them. Pa Jen feels that Goriot has manifested "the lofty character of mankind, and a reading of it moves people to great depths." (Articles Discussing Literature, p.430).

We feel there is nothing of the nature of "the lofty character of mankind." The tragedy of Pere Goriot precisely shows that in the capitalist world where "money is omnipotent," and "money is all evil", there is no place for "parent-child love." When we read this book, we are also moved to great depths. But what moves us is the stark cruelty and lack of feelings seen as the laws of monetary relationships in the bourgeois world were shredding to pieces the screen of sentimentality covering feudal family relationships. This is clearly a work which describes the change of social ethics resulting from the change in class relationships, but Pa Jen has labelled it a vendor of the theory of human nature. If we must say that Pere Goriot's exhibition is "human nature," then this story exactly shows that in the capitalist society, "human nature" has gone completely bankrupt, and not the universality and permanence of human nature.

In the "human nature" described by Pa Jen, the two points discussed above are comparatively more capable of confusing people. As to the other things like "the joy of living" and "the horror of death", for the modern Chinese people, these things

no longer have the power to hold them. As we all know, a man's view on death is fully determined by his view on life. And a man's view on life is determined by his class stand, his world outlook, and his outlook on life. Accordingly, though it is a universal law of biology that "life is only once for each man," this law cannot determine the outlook on life of a person. And so from this law we still cannot find anything that may add to the factors contributing to the artistic vitality of works.

As to "respect for manly courage and acts of knight errantry," this is different in nature to the questions of love and death, and we propose to analyze and criticize this later in the article.

IV

As stated above, we can clearly see that we have basic differences with the human nature theorists on the interpretation of the existence of classical works. Wherever they hold that a class reveals universal human nature, we hold that it is the manifestation of class character. And wherever we consider the manifestation of class character, they must resort to all means to interpret it as universal human nature.

However, by merely proving that what they hold as the revelation of universal human nature is really the manifestation of class character, we still do not answer the question as to why the classical works have the artistic vitality to withstand

the test of time. As Marx stated when he discussed Greek Art, "The difficulty does not lie in understanding the link between Greek art and epics with certain states in the development of society, but in understanding that they continue to supply us with artistic enjoyment, and in certain places in serving as a kind of standard and an unapproachable model." (Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on Literature, p. 59.) We must make this statement the point of departure in our groping after the problem.

Some comrades hold that classical works still possess magical power today because they use an unreproducible artistic technique to describe the life of so long ago, gone for ever. This is of course true. Our revolutionary teachers and literary teachers have discussed this penetratingly. But this point alone is inadequate to fully elucidate the basic character of the question. People may further ask: if the value of classical literature is merely in its significance in providing knowledge, then what great difference is there between classical literary works and works in other ideological departments - history and philosophy?

In his writings on political economy, Marx had quoted from Shakespeare's Timon of Athens, and also praised him for "very outstandingly described the nature of money." (See Marx

and Engels on Literature and Art, Liu Hui-i's translation, pp.39-42.) From the memoirs of Lafayette, we also learn that Marx and his family greatly loved, was fully conversant with, and even respected Shakespeare. It is clear that the significance of knowledge is not sufficient to understand all the reasons leading to the respect shown by Marx for this great playwright. For the general reader, there is no way of showing why he likes classical works apart from the need to understand the writer, to seek knowledge, and to enrich his own living experiences.

The practice in life has proved that people like the great classical literary works because these works to varying extent attract their soul. The same time as they learn from these classics the social life of the ancient age of the distant past, they also absorb many other things, enriching or elevating their spiritual life, rousing them to love good things to the end, and inciting them to indignation against unreasonable things.

Of course, people will also pay attention to the artistic form and technique of a work. But if a work fails to move the reader, he will generally not bother to study its technique. This shows that a great classical work moves people first because, in addition to reflecting the social life of a specific historical period, also reflects the advanced ideals and illu-

sions born out of the contradictions of such social life, lofty morals and characters, and experiences and traditions of struggles. All this belongs to the content of classical literature.

Naturally, the content of a work can only be revealed with a beautiful form and skilled technique. Though form and technique have only significance of the second order, we must nevertheless unify our observations of content, form, thinking and technique, if we are to come to a comparatively comprehensive conclusion on the question of the artistic vitality of a classic.

Chairman Mao told us, "Though the social life of mankind is the sole source of literature and art, though compared to the latter, it possesses incomparably rich and moving content, but the people are still not satisfied with the former and seek the latter. Why is it so? Because though both are beautiful, life reflected in the artistic and literary works can be more concentrated, more exemplary, and more ideal, and so has greater universality." (Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol.III,p.863.)

May we further generalize and extend the above words of Chairman Mao as follows: The more a classical work penetratingly reflects the real life of its time, the more advanced its ideological content, and the more it becomes an artistic pattern, its universality in exerting influence over the masses of the people will be greater, and it will all the more withstand the test of time. If such a generalization and extension is in the

main not mistaken, let us approach the question of the artistic vitality of great classical works from the angle of their ideological content.

As we all know, all the great classical works preserved today have been products of bourgeois society. The contents of these works are very rich and complex. This article of ours can only undertake a comparatively crude discussion of those contents comparatively closely connected with class struggle relationships. As to those works more remotely connected with class struggle, we shall study them in a separate article.

The development of history cannot be cut up. Class struggle permeates the whole history of class society. The struggle of the people of the first generation may have ended in defeat and become a thing of the past, but the ideals and aspirations for which they struggled, the courage and fearlessness they exhibited, the self sacrifice, the high degree of vigilance, the fraternal unity and spirit of love for members of their own class, and the experiences and lessons they gained in the struggle continually moved and educated the people of the next generation to rise again in struggle.

These things are comparatively the basic characteristics of the struggle of an earlier generation, comparatively of exemplary significance, and do not merely belong to the past, but to a certain extent, belong to the future. For this

reason, the classical works which to varying extent embody all these things will naturally draw forth to varying extent the support of the people of later generations who find a common ideological level with them.

Let us cite some examples from great classical works. Let us try to read the following lines from the poem "To T'an" (Felling the Sandalwood Trees) in the Odes:

He does not sow, nor does he harvest,
Why does he take away 300 bushels of grain?
He does not hunt, nor does he make the chase,
Why is his mansion filled with game?

Now read also the two lines written by our peasants during the struggle against landlords in land reform:

You place a hand on your heart, and ask yourself:
You feed well, and you clothe well, how does it happen?
The two poems are nearly three thousand years apart.

During this time, Chinese history has undergone numerous changes that shook the heavens and overturned the earth. The authors of the two poems are vastly different in ideological temperament and in world outlook. But there is similarity in the truth of opposition to exploitation persistently adhered to in both poems, and the hatred of the exploiting class. And this similarity has not been accidental.

This similarity may show that the ideological and feeling

expressed in "Po T'ian" can permanently rouse the support of the exploited working people or the working people who have already been liberated. At the same time it also shows that it has been no accident that the common support of the people of later generations can be roused by the poems of Tu Fu and Po Chu-i which exposed feudal exploitation and oppression.

In Yung-yang Hsien, Hsuan, there was written a folk song on the big leap forward circulated throughout the country:

The zeal of the youths exceeds that of Chao Yun;
The strength of the middle aged is greater than Wu Sung;
The teenagers are comparable to Lo Ch'eng;
The cadres plan strategy better than Chu-kuo Liang;
And the women excel Mu Kuei-ying.

Here the writer uses a series of lively heroic figures in China's classical novels and plays for comparison with the heroes of the masses who in the big leap forward have exhibited the spirit of moving mountains and filling up oceans. It shows that in their labor to conquer nature and in their struggle for their own liberation, our working people have consistently praised and loved the heroic figures who showed courage and stubbornness, sincerity and wisdom.

As we know, the various heroic figures named have since the days of T'ang and Sung been extensively circulated among the people. During the several centuries in which their stories

were circulated and written in their final forms, the people had used their own energy to nurture them, and enrich them with their own ideas and feelings, and ethical and artistic viewpoints.

These personalities created under the feudal ages must all have their limitations, but the people up to now still love them. This is because in these very animated figures, the people see the excellent traditions of our people, of our nation.

In Western classical literature, we may likewise find literary forms which realize the ethical and artistic ideals of the people and their tradition of struggle. The ancient Greek tragedian Aeschylus created the figure of the great rebel and martyr Prometheus who had roused the people of Europe of all ages. Later Goethe and Shelley, both bourgeois poets of genius and with the revolutionary spirit, developed in their own works the spirit of this rebel.

Here we may also discuss the question brought forward by Pa Jen, that of the spirit of manliness and knight errantry. Manliness and knight errantry were originally ^{by} a lofty characteristic and a revolutionary tradition created ~~by~~ the people in their spontaneous struggle against exploitation and oppression. This characteristic and tradition could only earn respect among the masses of the people. Pa Jen is thus wrong in saying that respect for manliness and knight errantry is a universal feeling of all mankind.

The acts of Pi Kan had no connection whatsoever with the traditional concept of manliness and knight errantry. In arbitrarily putting them together, Pa Jen is only using a base means intentionally to obliterate the class boundaries. As to Nieh Cheng, and Ch'ing K'o, the assassins of the period of the Warring States, their actions were praised and sung principally because they were heroes who resisted despotic rule. So those other assassins like Yu Yang and Chuan Chu, who merely gave their lives in the service of their personal patrons, have not been as respected as the first group.

In distorting the people's ethical and artistic concepts in distinguishing between love and hate, Pa Jen refers to them as supra-class human nature. He has an ulterior motive and attempts to use this to weaken people's hate for the exploiting class.

Moreover, the ruling class basically does not respect the good traits of "manliness and knight errantry." As we know, Ssu-ma Chien, who had been subjected to insult and persecution, had used his exuberant pen to laud the knight errants. He said of them: "They do not treasure their own bodies to go the rescue of the needy, and although they faced the greatest risks, they would not talk of their own feats, and sought to cover them up." (Shih Chi, Biographies of the Knight Errants.)

However, Pan Ku, standing on the side of the ruling class opposed Ssu-ma, accusing him of "toning down the men of letters and playing up the unscrupulous people using force." (Han Shu: Biography of Ssu-ma Chien). And in the section of "Biographies of Knight Errants" in the Han Shu, Pan Ku went further, writing, "Though insignificant persons, these knight errants usurped the power to kill, and their crimes should be punished by death." Is not this statement of Pan Ku a slap on the face of Pa Jen. As to certain members of the ruling class exploiting the "manly knight errants" to serve their own self interests, they can less be considered to show respect for knight errantry.

The ethics and tradition of the manly knight errants were continually handed down and continually developed in the course of history. Though because of the attempts of the ruling classes to obliterate them, documentary records are incomplete for us to fully review the process of the development of this tradition, nevertheless the process did exist.

First of all, in the days of Ch'in and the Western Han dynasties, from the records in Shih Chi, we find that such common people from the ranks of the city neighborhoods as Nieh Cheng, Ch'ing K'o, Hou Ying, Chu Hai, Chu Chia, and Kuo Chieh, did to varying extent and in different ways manifest such a noble characteristic. However, these were still the

acts of a small number of people resisting oppression of force, acts spurred by the feeling of justice and help to the down trodden. Such acts were greatly limited in scope.

By the time of the events described in Shui Hu Chuan (All Men Are Brothers), this "sense of righteousness" had become an effective weapon used by the peasant insurrectionist heroes to unite with the people and educate the people to rise jointly to resist the feudal rule. The scope of influence exerted by such a tradition was incomparably expanded compared with the days of Ch'in and Western Han. The objects of attack became more clarified. Of course, even in this age, it was still restricted by the viewpoints of the peasants, handicraftsmen, and city residents who were small property owners, and they could not draw up a clear cut platform for their struggle. And because of this limitation, there was a possibility of its being utilized by the ruling class.

However, in the Hung Chi Pu, the situation became vastly different. On the person of such a figure as Cho Lao-chung, we definitely discover a kind of heroic spirit of the type of "the men of Yen and Chao sing out in indignation," a kind of flavor which smacks of the national tradition of the "manly knight errant." However, compared with the sense of justice of the past, this tradition has undergone a change in quality. Under the influence of the education of the Party, it has been

developed into the spirit of fraternal love of the proletariat. In this way, we see the simple process of the development from ancient days to the present of the traditional spirit of "manly knight errantry" evolved by the Chinese people in struggle.

History is developing, social life is developing. All the ideals and illusions, ethics and characters, and the experiences and traditions of struggle of the oppressed and exploited peoples are also developing. In the process of the development, there are detours, there are setbacks, and the people continually break through old traditions and create new traditions. Nevertheless, in the new traditions we can still see the rational portions of the old traditions which have been preserved.

The above are the inherent factors in the contents of classical literature that has withstood the test of time. These are the factors which link up the lives and struggles of an earlier generation with those of a later generation in a moving manner, so that the people of a later generation may, from the struggles and life of the earlier generation as reflected in the classical works, recognize their own ways of living, evaluate their own living, enrich and elevate their own living experiences, and lead to various links and common stands. Sometimes, the links and common views they

established with the classical works would completely exceed the scope of the original ideological content of the works.

The inherent factors in the contents of classical works that can withstand the test of time can completely be understood and analyzed with the Marxist class viewpoint. The following passage in Communist Manifesto has stated well:

Up to now all social history has developed in the midst of the opposition between classes, and this opposition is different in each different age.

However, whatever the form of such opposition, in society, the exploitation by one group of the people of another group of the people is a fact common to all past centuries. Accordingly, it is not the least strange that the social consciousness of different ages, however they may differ in form, and are varied, always proceeded forward under a specified common state. That is, society developed under the ideological state which could only be eliminated thoroughly with the thorough elimination of the opposition between parties.

It is very clearly stated that where there are classes, there is class struggle; no matter what differences there may be in the form of such struggle, there must be a common characteristic, reflecting the social consciousness of the class struggle and naturally there must be a specific common form.

All exploiting classes have their exploitation, oppression and deception as their common ideological state. All exploited classes also have their common ideological state in anti-exploitation, anti-oppression and anti-deception.

In his article, "Critical Views on the National Question" Lenin developed the viewpoint of Marx and Engels. He pointed out that each nation has two kinds of national culture. On the one side there is the national culture of the landlords, priests and the bourgeoisie of the ruling position. On the other side is the national culture born naturally out of the living conditions of the working masses and the exploited masses, though it may be a not very well developed democratic and socialist national culture.

Speaking on Chinese history in his article, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," Chairman Mao said, "The Chinese nation is not only known to the world for its diligence and industry, but is at the same time a nation which greatly loves freedom and is rich in revolutionary tradition." (Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol.II, p.593.) It is clear that the national revolutionary tradition referred to by Chairman Mao is principally the revolutionary tradition created by the working masses and the exploited masses in their life and struggle. Reflected in culture, this tradition is the democratic and socialist culture. To use the words of Chairman Mao, it

is the excellent ancient culture of the people with democratic and revolutionary characteristics, and the cream of democracy in ancient culture.

In our classical works, the great works which reflect advanced ideals and illusions, lofty morals and characteristics, and valuable experiences and traditions constitute the portion of our culture of the people of ancient days. Of course, some of these great works were the collective creations of the people, and many were the creations of the great classical authors who had come under the influence of the ideological state of the exploited working masses.

As to the question whether the works of authors coming from the ruling class and the exploiting class can rouse the common feelings of the people, it can naturally be completely analyzed with the class viewpoint. But this is a question within the scope of the world outlook and popular character of the great classical authors. Each author also has his own specific and winding and complex course in creation. We cannot go into it penetratingly here.

Generally speaking, in history classical authors with a popular character come under the two following conditions. In the first situation, due to the development of the internal contradictions within the ruling class, there came into being a small number of writers who are dissatisfied with their own

class or certain measures of their class. They became despairing of their class, become gradually sympathetic with the people, and even turn to the side of the people. And so in their works to varying extent they reflect the ideas and wishes, the lives and struggles of the people. Belonging to this group are many great Chinese writers like Chu Yuan, Ssu-ma Chien, Li Po, Tu Fu, and Po Chu-i.

The second group of these classical authors are those bourgeois writers in the period of the ascendancy. In the article "The Ideological State of Germany," Marx and Engels pointed out that before the bourgeoisie ascended to the position of the ruling class, it had acted as representative of the various classes oppressed by the feudal class. At the time the class interests of these writers were to a definite extent linked up with the interests of the other classes. In "Introduction to Natural Dialectics," Engels referred to the representative cultural figures of the Renaissance. In his article, "What Legacies Do We Actually Reject," Lenin referred to the writers of the age of revelation in 18th century West Europe. All these are bourgeois writers of the period of ascendancy who could reflect the people's demand for opposition against feudalism.

V

What we have discussed above is very shallow and very premature. Moreover, it is only a part of the question we are

considering. If we are to more thoroughly elucidate this question, we shall have to carry out a more comprehensive study and discussion, taking into account the world outlook and the popular characteristics of the classical writers, the special characteristics which differentiate literary and artistic works from other ideological states, the question of the so-called "middle group" works, for the combined concrete analysis of classical works and authors.

We feel that these views we have here written are not yet sufficient for the concrete analysis of classical works and writers. Of course, this is not polite talk, but words spoken on the question of the direct solution of the theoretical problems. As to the criticism of the theory of human nature, we fully believe that our criticisms are correct. The preposterous views of the revisionist and bourgeois advocates of the theory of human nature only serve to confuse the true nature of the question, and absolutely do not contain an iota of truth.

For the positive elucidation of the question, in our analysis of classical works, we cannot but stem forth from the premise that these works possess a specific artistic vitality. So we have not touched upon those classical works which are negative, reactionary, and antiquated. However, this is definitely not to say that the things which we now recognize as in

possession of artistic vitality will "permanently" exist in the future, for any length of time to come. Much less do we mean that these works with artistic vitality are all one hundred percent essence, without any bit of rubbish, and not permitting any kind of criticism. In fact, each time human history enters a new historical stage, people must carry out a revaluation of the legacy of classical literature in accordance with the interests of their own class, and the political standards and artistic standards of their own class.

The revaluation of the legacy of classical literature with the proletarian standpoint had started in the age of our revolutionary teachers Marx and Engels. In his criticism of classical writers and works, Lenin has further left us a brilliant example. With the development of the Chinese revolution, the Chinese proletariat had attended to this question at an early date. In many of his works, Chairman Mao gave many directives on the acceptance of Chinese and foreign literary legacies, and these are still the most basic principles we should follow in our criticism of the acceptance of the literary legacy. We have carried out much beneficial work in the criticism of the acceptance of Chinese and foreign literary legacies in accordance with the directives of Chairman Mao. In the future, with the penetrating development of the socialist revolution, the work of the summing up of this work of criticism will no doubt

be carried out on a larger scale and promoted to a penetrating and thorough degree.

In the critical inheritance of legacies, the difference between us and the other ruling classes lies in the fact that our standards are proletarian standards and Marxist-Leninist standards. We definitely do not act as the old ruling classes in obliterating and distorting the value of the legacies. However, our criticism will be the most scientific and most rigid criticism of literary legacies in human history.

In "Anti-Duhrin," Engels referred to the criticism of literary legacies by the bourgeois revelationist scholars of the 18th century. He said, "They do not accept any kind of outside authority. Religion, outlook on nature, society, and state systems are all subjected to the most merciless criticism. All must appear before the tribunal of reason, or justify the reason for its own existence, or abandon that existence."

Our age is one which is beyond the comparison of the 18th century. It is the age of the conclusion of the system of private ownership of several thousand years. It is the age of the "resolute breaking down of all concepts handed down in the past. Why do we not let all great classical writers and classical works stand before the tribunal of proletarian reason?

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN TWO WORLD OUTLOOKS
ON THE QUESTION OF HUMAN NATURE

[The following is a full translation of an article entitled "Tsai jen-hsing wen-ti shang liang-ku shih-chieh-kuan ti t'ou-cheng" (English version as above), by Ma Wen-ping, appearing in Wen-i Pao (Literary Gazette) No. 12, Peiping, 26 June 1960, pp. 11-20.]

In openly propagating his "theory of human nature," Pa Jen quoted a section of the summary of Lenin's Philosophical Notes as the primary basis of his theory. Before quoting this summary in defense of his preposterous view that literature "must have for its basis things common to all people," Pa Jen sarcastically challenged Marxists: "You call this the theory of human nature? Then let us take a look at the words of Marx and Engels. Here I cannot help but 'dogmatize' a bit."⁽¹⁾

Where did Pa Jen get the words which he grabbed as the most precious treasure? It is a passage from the book Mad Family, one of the earliest collaborated writings of Marx and Engels, specially written by them to attack destructively the various kinds of transformed idealism, particularly the "Young Hegelist" Bruno Powell and his supporters. (The book was written in 1844, between September and November, and was published in February 1845.) The passage was placed over the signature

of Marx in "Critical Notes 2." The portion quoted by Pa Jen is reproduced here:

"The bourgeoisie and the proletariat are both the self transformation of man. But the bourgeois feels self satisfied and secure in the transformation, sees proof of his own strength and acquires the outward appearance of human living. The proletariat feels destroyed, and sees his helplessness and the reality of inhuman living. To use the words of Hegel, this class, under the condition of being abandoned, becomes hateful of the condition, the hate naturally produced by the contradiction between the basic nature of mankind in this class and its living conditions. They are the open, drastic and overall denial of human capability." (2)

Why do we want to discuss the passage he has quoted? The reason is very clear. Because Pa Jen has taken away from this passage its revolutionary spirit, and used it as the basis for his revisionist standpoint. If we do not clarify this point, people may be led into unnecessary misunderstanding. This misunderstanding may take at least two forms. The first is that Marx seems at first to be an advocate of the theory of human nature, and so a doubt may be raised over the succession to the early revolutionary ideas of Marx in his early works. The second

may be a lack of clarification on the real nature of the revolutionary spirit mentioned in this passage, so that a general affirmation is made without an understanding of the process of the development of the thinking of Marx from the earlier to the later stages, and the reason why revisionists generally go to the works of Marx and Engels of the early period.

In their debate with Pa Jen, some comrades have maintained a careful attitude and avoid touching on this passage of Marx quoted by Pa Jen. It is of course good to hold a careful attitude, but avoidance of an issue will not help its solution. So we must study, we must clarify, and we must develop a direct debate with Pa Jen on this question.

When we study and discuss this question, we must have an understanding of the thinking of Marx in the early years and the process of the evolution of the ideological system of Marxism. Only this will help the achievement of a correct understanding of the early works of Marx which are harder to read.

In his article "Karl Marx", Lenin pointed out that in the process of the maturity of Marx as a complete and perfect creator of the doctrine of Marxism, 1848 was an important mark. His representative work was the Communist Manifesto, published in February 1848, the first document in the nature of an outline of scientific Communism. Marx and Engels for the first time

"in this work used their genius and thoroughly clear language described a new world outlook."⁽³⁾ Before this time, Marx had turned from idealism to materialism, from revolutionary democracy to Communism (1842-1843.) This was followed by his serious divergence from the dialectics of Hegelian idealism (1843-1844), and the completion of the great revolution in the history of philosophical thought.

Marx himself had said that as a mature Marxist he completed the finishing touches in the forties. In the Preface to Critique of Political Economy, he wrote, "The decisive views of our understanding was for the first time described scientifically - though only in the form of dialectics - in my work, Poverty of Philosophy, written to oppose Proudhon."⁽⁴⁾

Lenin said, "Marx firmly established his own viewpoint during the period of 1844 to 1845."⁽⁵⁾ It can be seen that Mad Family was a work earlier in the period of the completion of the Marxist ideological system. At this time, one of the two great discoveries of Marxism, historical materialism, had already been in its embryonic form. Engels had written of the process of the discovery of historical materialism with Marx thus: "When I lived in Manchester, I had confronted the following point, namely, up to now, the economic facts which do not play a role, or only play a small role, in all historical works are, at least for the modern world, historical forces of

decisive significance. These economic facts provide the foundation for the birth of the modern situation of class antagonism. Such a state of antagonism is in turn the foundation of the evolution of different political parties and struggle among parties, in all countries which have reached full development by reliance on big industry, including England. It is thus the foundation of the entire structure of political history. Marx has not only arrived at the same understanding, but in the German and French Almanac of 1844, he has already summed up this view as follows: generally it is not the state which restraints and decides civic society, but it is civic society which restraints and decides the state, so that politics and its history must be interpreted with economic relations and their development, and not to the contrary. When I visited Marx in Paris in the summer of 1844, we were in complete agreement on all theoretical matters. Thus began our collaboration."⁽⁶⁾

The beginning of collaboration referred to by Marx referred to the authorship of Mad Family. Here they had already started to use the viewpoint of dialectic materialism to observe historical phenomena, and study social problems to debate with the philosophers who belittled the people, and denied the role of the proletariat. This is a work of important historical significance. It is a resolute counter attack against idealism launched for the first time by dialectic materialism. In accord-

ance with the analysis of the class situation of the proletariat, for the first time it brought forward the historic mission borne by the proletariat. Accordingly, Lenin valued the book very highly, and said that it "consolidated the foundation of the theory of revolutionary material socialism." (7)

Having understood this situation of the development of Marxist thought, let us return to look at the Philosophical Notes of Lenin quoted by Pa Jen. In Lenin's summary of Mad Family, we can see clearly that what Lenin grasped first was the spirit of historical materialism described in the book. Starting with the analysis of the antagonistic contradiction which held the primary position in the society of private ownership, Marx pointed out the opposition between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and proceeded to analyze the class position of the two hostile classes. He found that the bourgeoisie was the conservative force which consolidated this system of private ownership, whereas the proletariat was the revolutionary force opposed to the system of private ownership.

However, if the proletariat were to eliminate its own inhuman life, it must eliminate the bourgeoisie which sought to preserve the inhuman life of the proletariat as the condition for its own existence, and also eliminate the system of private ownership which the bourgeoisie strove its best to consolidate. This was decided by the law of the movement of the economy of

private ownership, and it was the mission which history bestowed upon the proletariat. Accordingly, in his summary, Lenin drew a general conclusion, saying, "It very clearly brings out the viewpoint of the role of the proletarian revolution which Marx had almost completely evolved."⁽⁸⁾

The strange thing is that in a theory of the proletarian revolutionary struggle which Marx clearly pointed out as involving the opposition of classes and class struggle, and which Lenin as summed up, how has it been possible for it to be quoted by Pa Jen to cover up the opposition between classes, to deny class struggle, to reject the proletarian revolution - the theory of human nature?

At the moment, let us further analyze the passage quoted by Pa Jen, and see what really is the basic spirit of Marx, and how Pa Jen distorted it with an ulterior motive.

In this passage, Marx started with the conception of "transformation" (the original German word is *Entfremdung*). This term was originally a terminology of Hegelian philosophy. It can also be translated as "placed at a distance," "made into an external existence," "alienated," "changed" or "negated." According to the interpretation of Hegelian idealism, it means that the world is created by spirit, and the entire process of the development of world history is the process of the development of the "absolute spirit." He divided the development of

the absolute spirit into three stages: the logical state, the natural stage, and the spiritual stage.

In the beginning there was only a kind of "absolute spirit," after the development of which it externally was changed or transformed into the world of nature, entering the second stage of the course of development of the absolute spirit. Hegel held that this stage, the world of nature, was only the concrete manifestation of the absolute spirit, and it was not a phenomenon of independent existence. He also held that the external transformation of the absolute spirit into the natural world was the degradation, retrogression and decline of the absolute spirit, the absolute idea.

However, because the spirit or idea possessed initiative and creativeness, it defeated the passive and ineffective world of nature, and returned to the spiritual stage, that is, the third stage of the development of the absolute spirit, the final stage and highest stage.

We can see here that this "transformation" of Hegel, this logical system of "restoration", is completely idealist. It is only the process of the development of pure spirit. Later he applied the conception of transformation to political economy and other fields, and he never left the foundation of idealism.

Though Marx had also used the terms transformation and restoration, their contents are however different in meaning, and are basically different from the concepts of Hegel. As everybody knows, Marx had thoroughly criticized Hegel's philosophy. Marx himself had said, "My dialectic is basically not only different from that of Hegel, but also absolutely opposite that of his. According to Hegel, the process of thinking, what he calls idea, and even the process of thinking which turns the idea into an independent body, is the creator of facts, and actual matter is only the external manifestation of the process of thinking. To me, it is exactly the opposite. Ideas are only the material phenomena moved to the minds of people and remolded in their minds." (9)

Accordingly, the terms transformation and restoration used by Marx have absolutely no connection whatsoever in content with the terms transformation and restoration used by Hegel. This is to say, Marx used these terms with a new significance. He continued to use the old term transformation because the new concept had not yet been evolved, and also "to make it easily intelligible to the philosophers." (10) With reference to things both before and after the transformation, both before and after the restoration, he always held that matter was the first nature, and spirit the secondary. Before he elucidated the question, he had given it new content, starting from the view-

point of materialism. Spirit is decided by matter. On this point alone he was quite different from Hegel.

In his Draft on Economics, Philosophy, Marx for the first time brought forward the theory of the "alienation of labor," and later, in Capital, this developed into the doctrine of the "Cult of the Worship of Commodities." (Naturally, the term transformation has more extensive implication, for in addition to economic, there are also religious, political and ideological transformations.) And the "transformation" he talked about in Mad Family is precisely a development of the basic principle in Draft on Economics, Philosophy of 1844. Because of the opposition between labor and products of labor, between labor and objects of labor, and between wages and capital, created by the system of private ownership, ultimately there would be the opposition between man and man. And so the people who were united in the original classless society became divided into different classes with different interests and opposed to one another. By the time of capitalist society where the private ownership was highly developed, the class opposition became the more acute.

Accordingly, in saying here that "the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were both the self transformation of man," he was of course referring to the division of the two classes whose economic interests were basically opposed to each other.

Marx further started from the objective fact of the division of mankind into two opposed classes, and followed up with an analysis of the characteristics of the different classes evolved from different class status. Because of the transformation produced by this private ownership system, the bourgeoisie came into possession of the products of labor, and used them to be changed into daily growing material forces, so that it felt itself powerful and satisfied. So it wanted to consolidate this exploitative system of private ownership.

The opposite was the case with the proletariat. Due to the series of "alienation of labor" caused by the system of private ownership, the products of labor it produced were changed into capital to oppose itself. The more wealth it produced, the poorer it became. The greater the forces of the material wealth it produced, the weaker it became. So it actively demanded the overthrow of that exploitation system. Accordingly, immediately following his statement that "the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are both the self transformation of man," he followed up, with the conclusion, "It can thus be seen that within the scope of the entire opposed situation, the private owners are on the conservative side, and the proletariat on the destructive side. From the former came action to preserve the opposition situation. From the latter came action to eliminate the same

situation."(11)

This precisely explains that different classes determine the direction of the history of the two classes. This is to say, opposition to exploitation and demand for revolution became the class character of the proletariat, while support of exploitation, support of private ownership and opposition to revolution became the class character of the bourgeoisie.

However, Pa Jen does not like this conclusion. So he cut off this section of the conclusion which cannot be cut off from the preceding discussion, and hastily quoted a further lower passage concerning "the actual loss by the proletariat of all things compatible with human nature, even the loss of everything compatible with the outward appearance of human nature..."(12) He is so interested in phrases containing the words "human nature" and "non human nature" purely because he is in a hurry to lead to his so-called "while man has class nature, he has also humanitarianism which comes from the basic nature of mankind".

In such a case, how are we to understand Marx's words that after the "self transformation of man," both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat had become "non-human nature," while the proletariat had even lost what "was compatible with the outward appearance of human nature?"

First of all, we must clarify the fact that what Marx said here about "human nature" and "non-human nature" are not conceptions within the same historical scope. Marx and Engels had clearly pointed out that people not bound by the private ownership system "are no longer people under the system of the division of labor, philosophers are using the name 'real man' as an ideal to represent them."⁽¹³⁾

Accordingly, "man," "human nature," and "basic nature of mankind" must refer to people in the past or future society without the system of private ownership. In the aforementioned "self transformation of man," Marx referred to the united "man" in the classless society who became divided into "class man" in a society with opposing classes, then, the so-called "non-human nature" was precisely the result of the "transformation" of the "united human nature" in the classless society. So "non-human nature" precisely referred to the "split human nature" in the society of private ownership, that is, the various "class natures." This is because at the time Marx in his early works had not yet started the use of the clear cut new concept of "class nature," and so he used the general concept of "non-human nature" to show the content of the "split human nature" of the class society.

Next, we must understand that the "human nature" and "non-human nature" stated by Marx here both had concrete social

content. In the society without private ownership, "human nature" must be revealed through such harmonious relations: labor is man's first need, the products of labor are enjoyed by the laborers, in production and between man and man, the relationship is one of cooperative comrades. But in the society with private ownership, everything is changed into the opposite - harmonious relationship is turned into opposition, "united human nature" is transformed into "split human nature", and "human nature" is transformed into "non-human nature."

Because the two split classes occupy different positions in production relations, the manifestation of "non-human nature" also becomes different, and even the "outward appearances of human nature" also become markedly opposed. (In the sense that it refers to "the split human nature," "non-human nature" may be explained as "class character;" but here we must not confuse "non-human nature" with the class character of the two classes we often talk about.)

Since the bourgeoisie can possess the products of labor without performing labor, and individuals can be enriched at the expense of society so that others suffer and they themselves happy, then they will be more and more divorced from labor, divorced from objects of production, and divorced from their clans, to completely change into selfish creations who seek only to satisfy their own physical desires. Though they still

possess all the material conditions which conform with "the outward appearances of human life," they are also used for the satisfaction of biological desires. This makes for the birth of the exploitation nature, the selfish nature, and the luxurious nature - the class characteristic of all exploiting classes.

Marx had a moving and symbolic description of the characteristics of the basic nature of the bourgeoisie, on the basis of the description of a bourgeois element by a landlord. "He is cunning, salesmanlike, a difficult customer, deceptive, avaricious, purchasable, fraudulent, without compassion and without a head, alienated from public organizations and betraying public organizations, issuing usurious loans, pulling strings, slavish and submissive, talkative, outwardly presentable, good looking but unsubstantial, dry and tasteless, producing competition and thereby producing charity enterprises and crimes, producing the relaxation of all social pivotal activities, fostering such relaxation, tolerating such relaxation, disregarding honor, disregarding principle, entirely prosaic, entirely empty, and swindler of money with regard for nothing!"⁽¹⁴⁾

This is just as Engels said, "man is completely transformed under the rule of money" and even the bourgeois himself "becomes the slave of matter."⁽¹⁵⁾ All the characteristics of

property are the class characteristics of this class. All these ugly qualities of the bourgeoisie have come because he has violated the basic character of mankind - labor. So from the real quality of his class character, he himself is divorced from labor, and occupies the products of other people's labor, the whole time living as a parasite on the exploitation of others. This is "most non-humane", the real "inhuman" creatures (in the most basic meaning of the word.)

The class character of the proletariat completely reveals another kind of characteristics. The proletarian "non-human nature" referred to by Marx principally referred to his class position and living conditions, which came from the "alienation of labor." Though it is closely connected with labor, but cannot carry out freely creative labor. Though there is close cooperation in large social production, labor has to remain divided under the pressure of the material forces it has created itself. Though each day it uses its own labor to reform the world, but the material world which is the object of its labor is always drifting away (the threat of unemployment.) Though it produces more and more wealth for society each day, the society is making it poorer each day, until it loses the minimum living conditions for a man. "Man has receded to the state of living in the cave, and even light

and air, the simplest of animal purities, cease to become the desires of man." (16)

And so under such conditions, even "the outward appearances of human nature" have been negated. Because of such an inhuman situation and such inhuman living, the proletariat had to demand for the resistance of this state of "non-human nature," and the elimination of its own living conditions. "If it does not eliminate its own living conditions, it will not liberate itself. If it does not eliminate all the living conditions which violate human nature, and are concentrated in its own situation, it cannot eliminate its own living conditions." (17)

In this way, there came into existence the resistance character, the struggle character, the adhesive character, and the unity character, all special class characteristics of the proletariat. This class character would in the course of struggle be growingly awakened and strengthened. Marx and Engels from the beginning paid special attention the process of the growth of the most basic characteristic of the proletariat, the revolutionary character (the negation of "non-human nature"). In Mad Family and Conditions of the British Working Class, they had in 1844 made an earnest analysis.

Lenin also had a moving description: "A revolutionary is one who realizes the state of his own enslavement and fights it. One who does not realize the state of his own enslavement

and lives the life of a slave silently and ignorantly is a one hundred percent slave. One who gratuitously praises the good life of a slave and expresses unbounded "gratitude" for his good hearted master is a slave of the basest type, a shameless fellow." (18)

It can thus be seen that the anti-exploitation struggle of the proletarian warriors is precisely the realization of the basic class character of the proletariat. Because the proletariat consistently strives for existence in accordance with the basic character of mankind, the laboring man, represents the new productive forces in the demand for the negation of the "alienation of labor" produced by the private ownership system, so speaking from the viewpoint of the real content of the class characteristic of the proletariat, it is truly in conformity with "human nature." On this point, it is diametrically opposed to the real content of the class character of the bourgeoisie.

Where can we find a common point in two class characters so different in their basic quality (this is decided by the economic relations and class status)? Pa Jen must arbitrarily seek the common ground of two opposed classes. The basis for his theory is as follows: since the proletariat "hates" this "non-human nature," then is not the demand of the proletariat for liberation the desire to return to its basic nature of man-

kind? Since only with the liberation of all mankind may it liberate itself. then, "for the liberation of all mankind, the liberation of the basic nature of mankind there must be something common to all people as the foundation. This foundation is human feeling, and it is the humanitarianism which comes out of the basic nature of mankind." And so the advocate of the theory of human nature finds a place to lodge himself.

Pa Jen even assumes the proud tone of a teacher to teach us, "The advocates of the class theory in our literature still do not seem to understand this keypoint."⁽¹⁹⁾ This is really no "keypoint" but a "trick." He hopes thus to finally lead people into the labyrinth of the abstract theory of human nature. However, Pa Jen is not one who immediately starts with the negation of your class character. Before the iron-clad fact of the opposition of the classes, he cannot but be forced to accept that each class has its own class character, and so he also cannot fully reject the existence of class struggle.

What then is left for him to make capital of? It is to turn the struggle into an abstract thing, to make the goal of the struggle an abstract objective. He places before the people the following formula of logic: since both the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are "non-human," let both abandon their "non-human nature" and return to the basic nature of mankind! Since in addition to his class character, man has also the

basic nature of mankind, (or things common to all people), then struggle with this basic nature of mankind! The result is that he uses the abstract "human nature" as weapon to win the goal of the abstract "human nature," which means in effect the elimination of class struggle.

To provide more "theoretical basis" for his theory of human nature, in addition to grabbing the general concept of "transformation," Pa Jen also closely grabs the general concept of "restoration."

However, the so-called "restoration" is also "return." The general concept of restoration is to be understood in some way. True, in the early works of Marx, this concept had been used. For example, in Draft on Economy, Philosophy, published in the same year as Mad Family, he referred to this concept of restoration, and linked it directly with human nature.⁽²⁰⁾ When Marx used this philosophical terminology, he clearly meant it as the antonym of transformation. If transformation is considered the first "negation," then restoration should be considered the second "negation," that is "the negation of a negation." From human nature to non-human nature, and thence back to human nature - this is the process of the development of the negation of a negation.

Of course, the change from human nature to non-human nature - the "transformation" from the "united human nature" of

the primeval communist society without private ownership to the split human nature of the society of private ownership divided into opposed classes - is a qualitative change. And the change from non-human nature to human nature - the restoration of the split human nature of the society with private ownership to the united human nature of the Communist society which has eliminated private ownership - is likewise a qualitative leap forward.

Not only is there qualitative difference between human nature and non-human nature, but due to the different historical contents of the human nature (though in both cases it is the united human nature of one society) of two societies in completely different stages of economic development (though both are societies of communal ownership), the human natures of the two periods also contain qualitative differences.

Accordingly, it is clear that "restoration" is not necessarily adverse "resurrection", nor is it the "recurrence" of a cycle. In 1877, Engels anticipated the Communist scene after the elimination of private ownership in these words: "By this time - and in a certain sense ultimately - man leaves the world of animals, proceeding from barbarous conditions of living to really human living conditions.This is mankind's leap from the kingdom of nature to the kingdom of freedom." (21)

However, 33 years before Engels made this prophecy, that

is, in 1844 when Mad Family was written, Marx had already stated in Draft on Economics and Philosophy, "Communism actively abandons the system of private ownership, that is, man's self alienation ... and carries out the restoration of mankind as one society, that is, the complete, conscious, and still fully and luxuriantly growing human nature."⁽²²⁾ This is completely different from the resurrective type of "restoration" used by Pa Jen.

Moreover, since restoration refers to the leap forward of quality, refers to a second negation, then this negation is the struggle and solution of the opposition. The result of a struggle between opposites is that one opposite side defeats the other opposite side, and this also means the negation of one thing and the affirmation of another, that is, the so-called "abandonment" and "simultaneously overcome and preserved."⁽²³⁾ In the process of the abandonment in the change from non-human nature to human nature, it does not mean that both the opposite classes are simultaneously overcome and/or simultaneously preserved, but rather that the proletariat which represents the direction of historical development overcomes the bourgeoisie which is a dying force. It is the process of the class character of the proletariat overcoming the class character of the bourgeoisie, and the process of the so-called "establishment of the proletariat and the elimination of the bourgeoisie."

Of course, the proletariat which as the new born force is continuing its development will itself go through a process of abandonment. But this is not self destruction, but only the overcoming of the non-human position and non-human life of the oppressed, and the overcoming of certain backward ideas which came therefrom. Its side as the laborer will not see greater development with the real liberation of labor and the overcoming of the alienation of labor. Today, the Communist style of the working people has been greatly developed, precisely because of the development of the excellent special qualities of the class character of the proletariat.

Because this is the class which represents the movement of history, the class with the greatest future, it will develop into the class that will carry the whole world population. By that time, the hostile classes will be completely obliterated, and the role of the proletariat in the opposition of classes will also disappear. By that time the special features of the class character of the working class will be dissolved into the special features of all mankind. By that time, as Comrade Liu Shao-ch'i said, "The common basic nature of mankind, common human nature, will be evolved. This is the complete process of the reform of the basic quality of mankind."⁽²⁴⁾ It is also as Marx said, "the restoration of human nature" with a new quality", the result of the continual change of the basic nature

of mankind in the course of the development of production. (25)

Accordingly, the achievement of the new and unified human nature is not accomplished, as Pa Jen says, with the cessation of the current class struggle, and using "things common to all men" to convert the other side, but precisely with the development of the class struggle, overcoming one enemy after another. The reason why the proletariat wants to liberate all mankind the same time it liberates itself, is also not due to the cause arrived at by Pa Jen, the so-called subjective desire for "the struggle to liberate human nature," but rather due to the decision of the law governing economic movement of the system of private ownership itself, and it is a mission entrusted by history.

Just as Marx and Engels said in the book quoted by Pa Jen, the Mad Family, "If the socialist writers will bestow this role of historical significance on the proletariat, then it will definitely not be like critical criticism which insists on our belief that this is because they look upon the proletariat as a god." (26) As Lenin in Philosophical Notes specially pointed out, This Marxist theme of the revolutionary role of the proletariat is the natural conclusion from the analysis of historical materialism.

It can be seen that the viewpoints of "transformation" and "restoration" of Marx are revolutionary in their basic spi-

rit. However, because in their early works Marx and Engels had not yet completed their entire ideological system, sometimes they continued the use of terms in classical philosophy, and in individual places they were still not yet entirely rid of their influence. The Marx and Engels we know always examined and evaluated their works with a rigid spirit. When more than 20 years later, in 1867, Marx discussed his Mad Family, his self criticism was that at the time he had a higher estimate of Fueurbach, "Though the worship of Fueurbach now creates humorous effects on the people," but they "are not ashamed of this work." (27)

At that time Fueurbach produced such great influence that Marx and Engels, in writing the preface of the book, openly brought out "real humanitarianism" to oppose spiritualism (though when the book was written, Marx had already greatly surpassed Fueurbach). The reason for this was clearly explained by Engels in Fueurbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy, written after the death of Marx. Engels further explained that he had to write this book because he felt that in the past he had not sufficiently criticized the Fueurbach system, and he wanted to "use a succinct and systematic form to explain our attitude toward Hegelian philosophy, to explain how we started from this philosophy and how we left it," and "the influence Fueurbach exercised over us." (28)

This reveals to us one important point, namely, when we read the early works of Marx and Engels, we must read their later works at the same time, compare them, and see the process of the evolution of their thinking and the Marxist ideological system. When we read Mad Family, the earliest book which elucidates historical materialism, we must at the same time read earlier and the/later works of Marx and Engels, particularly such books as Criticism of Hegelian Philosophy (1843); Draft on Economics, Philosophy (1844); The Poverty of Philosophy (1847); Ideological State of Germany (1846); as well as Fueurbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy (1888) and Outline of Fueurbach. Only then shall we get a more correct and deeper understanding.

When the Marxist ideological system had not yet been completely evolved, some new concepts had not yet been born, and Marx could not but make use of certain old concepts in many places, such as "transformation," and "restoration." Old concepts can be used to express new contents, but also can make people read them in the old contents of these old concepts. The revisionists often want to exploit this loop-hole. So we must pay special attention to correct them. We must know clearly the established inherent meaning, and also pay attention to their development and change.

Furthermore, we must also make some comparison of the

uses made of the concepts in the early and late stages, to understand what concepts had been abandoned by Marx and Engels and what others had new contents instilled into them. Only then may we arrive at a correct understanding of the works through the clarification of the concepts. The old concepts of classical philosophy, such as "human nature" and "basic nature of mankind" can hardly be found in the works of Marx and Engels after 1846.

We can only obtain nutrition and arms from the early works of Marx and Engels if we really stand firmly on Marxist ground, and treat these early works with the viewpoint of development and not that of doctrinaireism, and with a solemn but not flippant attitude.

The revisionists adopt an attitude completely opposite ours. They insist on closing their eyes to the works of the period of mature Marxism, or pretend they do not exist even when they see it. They are fond of searching into the early works of Marxism, to unearth remnant fragments of the armors of the early 19th century and even the 18th century, even though these might only be used by the classical writers of Marxism to fight the enemy and were abandoned afterward. They would pick them up as if they had discovered the "new spirit" of Marxism, in order to linger after the old through their old on these articles and resurrect them in new bodies. This is precisely the

special characteristic of the so-called "inheritance of legacy" by all revisionists and reactionary thinkers.

Today they no longer dare to openly borrow weapons from the reactionary ideological arsenal, and so they spend great pains to seek fragmentary sentences and phrases from the early works of Marx, and then place them under disguise. They do so because the truth of Marxism possesses such prowess that even its enemies have to make use of his great name to vend smuggled goods. Pa Jen is exactly such a figure.

In his extensive quotation of Marxist works to explain "human nature," Pa Jen has not not elucidated the most basic class viewpoint and development viewpoint of Marx on the question of human nature and thence explain on the stand of historical materialism the most basic theme of the mission of the world proletarian revolution. He has rather secretly substituted the concepts of Marx in accordance with his own reactionary aims, or else he has harmonized the ideas of Marx and those of the bourgeois Feuerbach and Hegels, but leaving out the rational contents of Hegel and Feuerbach and developing their backward and reactionary side. Such is the method of substitution and confusion used by Pa Jen and all revisionists, throwing out the moving revolutionary character of the classical writers of Marxism and finally leading to the opposite road in accordance

with their own reactionary aims.

As a matter of fact, on the approach to human nature, very clear ideological distinctions between Marx, and Hegel and Feuerbach. As early as in January 1844, when he wrote Criticism of Hegelian Philosophy, Marx clearly said, "Man is not something which rests abstractly outside the world. Man is the world of man, the state, and society."⁽²⁹⁾ One year later, in Outline of Feuerbach, he again pointed out, "The basic characteristic of man is not the abstract thing belonging to each individual. From the point of realism, the basic characteristic of man is the sum total of all social relationships."⁽³⁰⁾

The social nature of man is the basic point by which man is different from animal and is called "man", and this may also be considered a point common to "mankind." There are of course also common points from the viewpoint of natural traits, but in the satisfaction of natural impulses, man generally follows specific social formulae and social conditions..So Marx said, "Society is the unity of mankind and nature of a complete basic character."⁽³¹⁾

If we interpret man merely from the anthropological or biological viewpoint, we cannot ultimately separate man from the animal world. Only through the social character of man, that is, understanding man from the sociological viewpoint, may we have an overall recognition of the basic cha-

racter of man.

At the same time, "mankind" cannot exist merely as an abstract collective noun, for it refers to groups or masses of people living in different historical stages, and occupying different social positions under different forms of production. After the birth of class society with private ownership, the social nature of mankind (common nature) exists through the class character (individual character) manifested by social groups with conflicting basic interests. So we say that in a class society, the social character of man is his class character. For no general characteristic, or common characteristic, can exist in an abstract manner, and can only exist concretely in an individual characteristic.

Since in a class society, the basic interests of different classes are diametrically opposed to one another, then it is impossible to find any real and concretely existing common "united human nature" inside or outside the class character of the two opposing classes. This is what Chairman has precisely pointed out, "Is there such a thing as human nature? Of course there is. But there is only human nature in the concrete, no human nature in the abstract. In a class society there is only human nature that bears the stamp of a class, but no human nature transcending classes." (32)

All historical idealists do not accept the fact that in a class society, the social character of man exists in the concrete through the class character, but hope to grab certain points common to mankind (all possessing the stamp of society and possessing the stamp of nature), to make observations apart from concrete historical and social conditions, hoping to extract therefrom a kind of "human nature", permanent and unchanging, deprived of concrete content, and applicable to all ages and all classes. This actually is an abstract concept imagined in the head but non-existent in any living person in a specific society.

Sometimes from individual bodies they do find to varying extent the existence of a few signs of consciousness belonging to different classes, and borrowing for their basis the words of Lenin saying that there is nothing pure in this world, they come to the conclusion that "common human nature" exists in a class society. This not only rejects Lenin's emphasis on the differentiation of things according to their quality, but also puts together the general and the special, attempting to use the specific to represent the universal.

Furthermore, we also see that when the people of class A are influenced by the people of class B, this precisely occurs during a class struggle, and is precisely the possible

effect or transformation which can happen to the two struggling class characteristics under specific social living conditions. And this desire to transform the opposite side into one's own side precisely explains the birth of class antithesis and the antithesis of class ideologies.

Accordingly, the observation of man from any viewpoint divorced from social character and class character must bring "man" back to the anthropological or biological significance, or dissolve "man" in the abstract "absolute idea." Marx had precisely thus criticized the viewpoints of Hegel and Feuerbach. In Hegel, man, the basic quality of man, equals "self consciousness." In Feuerbach, man is abstract, biological, and can only love in an abstract manner.

And Pa Jen precisely wants to seek a compromise between such conflicting ideas. In an all embracing manner, he accepts from Marx class character, and takes over from Hegel and Feuerbach "human nature", thus coming to the dual conclusion, "Man has his class characteristic, but also has the basic nature of mankind."⁽³³⁾ If you merely take a look over his works, such adulterated goods are found everywhere, such as the following: "A class 'man' still possesses the general common nature of mankind;" "apart from social consciousness there is the general consciousness of mankind;" "in addition to his specific class characteristic and social consciousness, any concrete man also

has the general common nature and common consciousness of mankind;" "the class 'man' is still the 'man' of mankind;" ... (34)

Since there are two things, are they to co-exist peacefully, without distinction of host and guest, and without friction? No. Not only on the basic question of philosophy, it is not permitted the reply yes or no, but also in actual life, such a conclusion is impossible. Pa Jen is truly propagating, not the class theory, but the theory of human nature. His love and hate are distinctly clear. He exclaims, "O soul, return! .. O human feeling?" Human feeling is the foundation of the things "common to all people", another name for Pa Jen's abstract human nature.

We may here put down a large number of Pa Jen's synonyms for "human nature," but it is worthy of greater attention to see that each name to different degrees of significance reveals the "special quality" of Pa Jen's "human nature." It can be the highest moral quality of mankind, "capable of rousing the people of all ages and different classes," and possessing "the common characteristics of mankind in general." It can also be a political standard - "Conscience is the eye of the people. We must abide by conscience in serving the people." It can also be the measure of art - "The immortal spell of Greek art is due to its revelation of real human nature," It can be the ideal of aesthetics, "In the concept of beauty there may also be things common to mankind in general." And finally, it can also directly

serve as the foundation of mankind, "The common needs and common aspirations of the people can only build up different social relationships." (underlined parts as in original) (35)

Oh, the great "human nature!" It is the "foundation," primary body, and starting point of everything, and is the revelation of the most true, most perfect and most beautiful that is in this world and out of it. Whoever says that his is Feuerbach's anthropologism is truly "vulgarizing" him. It is truly Hegel's purest, most permanent, and greatest "absolute spirit." There is no age which it cannot transcend, nothing which is beyond its reach. Anything can perish, but "human nature" alone will live forever. Everything else is an accident of history, but "human nature" alone is the natural outcome of history.

It looks like this is inconceivable. But idealist philosophy is itself a riddle. Some people say, Pa Jen does not advocate biological "natural character," and the love of anthropologism, doesn't he? How is it that he should enter the labyrinth of Hegel? Yes, we proceed from Hegel to the labyrinth of ^{speculative} thought, we proceed from Feuerbach to the "religion of love." But religion and speculation are both palaces of idealism. You have not gone the wrong way.

However, what cannot make people understand all at once is why Pa Jen, starting from Marx, should go over to the camp

right opposite. If we do not evaluate a man by his dress, but by his action, then this will not be difficult to understand. For among the people who visit the arsenal of Marx, some come to seek the classics, some come to make a show of themselves, and others dig holes in the arsenal and smuggle supplies for sale. To which group does Pa Jen belong? Is it not self evident?

However, there is one point seen by all. When Pa Jen cuts off a section of the "text" of Marx (excuse us for using this term, for to Pa Jen there can be no better term with reference to Marxism) from Lenin's Philosophical Notes, and puts it into the middle of his own article, a place had been set for it. Its insertion is used only as "a valid reason", but the premise and the conclusion had also been previously set. The premise is "the thing common to all people," and the conclusion is "there is also the basic nature of mankind." As the saying goes, Ssuma Chao's intentions are obvious to the people on the road, and there is no need to elaborate here.

After the robe has been taken off, everything is clear. Pa Jen so laboriously teaches people with "human nature", and so painstakingly seek the theoretical basis for his "theory of human nature," so effusively adores "human nature" with all shades of brilliance, and so energetically shout: "We must love people" (love your class enemy), all because of a secret

already laid out, but not publicly uttered: the class struggle can cease, the proletarian revolution can fold up!

However, it is precisely this fierce class struggle, this struggle between two world outlooks in ideology we are concerned with. We cannot afford to listen to the dreamy words and deception of "love" of the bourgeoisie and the imperialists. We must remember closely the teaching of Chairman Mao: "We cannot love the enemy, cannot love the ugly phenomena of society, for our aim is to eliminate these things." (36)

June 1960, in the Literary Research Class,
Chinese People's University.

Notes:

- (1) Pa Jen: "On Human Feeling", Hsin-kang, January 1957 issue.
- (2) Quoted from Pa Jen's "On Human Feeling." The original passage is in Lenin's Philosophical Notes, p.7, and the original (which Lenin quoted) is in Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.II, p.44.
- (3) Lenin: On Marx, Engels and Marxism, p.17
- (4) Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.I, p.342 (1958 ed.)
- (5) On Marx, Engels and Marxism, p. 19.
- (6) Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.II, p 341.
- (7) On Marx, Engels, and Marxism, p. 50.
- (8) Philosophical Notes, p. 6.

- (9) Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.I p.35
- (10) Ideological State of Germany, translated by Kuo Mo-jo,
Chun-i Publishing House 1950 edition, p. 71.
- (11) Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 44.
- (12) Ibid, p.45.
- (13) Ideological State of Germany, p. 138.
- (14) Draft on Economics, Philosophy p. 71.
- (15) Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, p.664
- (16) Draft on Economics, Philosophy, pp.96-97.
- (17) Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.II, p.45.
- (18) Complete Works of Lenin, Vol.XIII, p.36.
- (19) Pa Jen:"On Human Feeling."
- (20) Draft on Economics, Philosophyp.82
- (21) Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.II, p.152.
- (22) Draft on Economics, Philosophy, p. 82.
- (23) Engels, "Anti-Duhrin," 1956 edition, p. 143.
- (24) Liu Shao-ch'i:"Class Character of Man."
- (25) Marx:"Poverty of Philosophy," see Complete Works of
Marx and Engels, Vol.IV, p.174.
- (26) Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.II, pp.44-45.
- (27) Correspondence of Marx and Engels, People's Publishing
House 1958 edition, Vol.III p.436.
- (28) Preface to "Feuerbach and the End of German Classical
Philosophy", 1959 People's Publishing House edition.

- (29) Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol.I, p.452
- (30) Feuerbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy, p.52
- (31) Draft on Economics, Philosophy, p.85.
- (32) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol.III, p.871.
- (33) Pa Jen: "On Human Feeling".
- (34) (35) Pa Jen: "Articles Discussing Literature," 1957 edition,
pp.95, 159, 317, 99, and 140.
- (36) Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol.III, p.872.

CRITICIZING THE BOURGEOIS "THEORY
OF HUMAN NATURE"

[The following is a full translation of an article entitled "Tzu-chan chieh-chi jen-hsing-lun p'i-p'ing" (English version as above), by Lin Ching-yao, Hsu I-tu and Liu Pang-fu, appearing in Hsin Chien-she (New Construction), No.7, reiping, 7 July 1960, pp 1-8.]

The viewpoint of the "theory of human nature" of modern revisionism is a kind of ideological weapon currently used by the bourgeoisie against the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. However, the so-called "theory of human nature" and "humanitarianism" are not new goods. As we all know, the modern revisionists have not made any great discoveries of their own in their advocacy of "individual happiness of man," "sympathy and friendly love of human nature between man and man," "humanitarianism of the basic nature of mankind common to all men," and "love of mankind." Those who know the history of philosophy understand that the so-called "human nature," "humanitarianism," and "love of mankind" common to all men are the characteristics of bourgeois historical outlook.

The social historical outlook of the anthropologism of Feuerbach, the materialist of the 19th century, in Germany, is typically representative of this kind of "philosophy of human nature." The "theory of human nature" and "humanitarianism"

at present advocated by the modern revisionists are nothing but the broken weapons which, in the age of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, under the conditions of the aggravation of class contradictions and class struggles, were used against the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.

In theory they are completely replicas of bourgeois philosophy, and the reactionary bourgeois world outlook. Lenin had stated correctly that in philosophy, the revisionists all followed behind the "science" of the bourgeois professors. It is the same with the theory of human nature of the modern revisionists. Take for example the explanation of "man," the basic character of man. The human nature theorists today only merely reproduce Feuerbach's "philosophy of human nature."

I

Feuerbach was the most outstanding materialist before the time of Marxist philosophy. Germany in the thirties and forties of the 19th century faced the struggle against the feudal despotic system, particularly the struggle against feudal divine rights. In this struggle, Feuerbach used as his weapon the combative atheism to criticize religion, theology and Hegel's philosophy of the absolute. He put up materialism against idealism and restored the authority that was due to materialism.

In this struggle Feuerbach laid his hands on one thing, the so-called "man", and made him the starting point and basis

of his own philosophy. He rejected the name materialism, and named his philosophy "anthropologism," or in short, the philosophy of man, the philosophy of human nature. From the viewpoint of social history, he used bourgeois humanitarianism against divine rights, and at the time this held progressive significance. But because Feuerbach was not a dialectic materialist, he could not understand the basic characteristic of man, and this naturally led him into the abyss of idealism in his viewpoint of social history. This is revealed prominently in his "theory of human nature."

What is the basic characteristic of man? On this point Marxist philosophy is basically opposed to the philosophy of Feuerbach.

Feuerbach held that "the entire character of man is different from animal."⁽¹⁾ In such a case, how is man different from animal, and what is the basic characteristic of man? He said, "What is the basic character of man in man's own thinking? What are the things that constitute a species, a real human species? They are reason, will, and feeling. A complete man has the capacity for thought, will power, and feeling. The capacity for thought is the light of knowledge; will power is the strength of character; and feeling is love. Reason,

⁽¹⁾ Selections from the Philosophical Works of Feuerbach,
San Lien Book Co. 1959 edition, Vol.I, p.182.

love, and will power are perfect characteristics, the supreme power. They are the absolute characteristics which make man a man, and constitute the goal of his existence." (1)

In a word, the highest mark of man's difference from animal is reason and thinking, and not man's labor, and man's practice in production. Feuerbach did not explain man's reason, will power, and feelings from the production practice and class struggle of man, but merely from the common physiological foundations of man, from his sensual organs. He said, "There is no need here to transcend the scope of sensation, to make a concrete body on a plane higher than the animal. ... Universal functionability is reason, and universal sensitiveness is spiritual. .. Even the intestine of man, though we so belittle it, is not something animal in nature, but something human in nature." (2)

According to Feuerbach's own theory, sensuous organs and feelings are things common to man and animal, and the difference is merely that a thing common to both becomes human when found on man, and is elevated to a higher level, a spiritual level. "The feelings of animal are animal, the feelings of man are man." (3)

(1) German Philosophy from Late 18th Century to Early 19th Century, Commercial Press 1960 edition, p.484.

(2) Selected Philosophical Works of Feuerbach, Vol.I, p. 183.

(3) Ibid, p. 212.

It is very clear that according to the philosophy of Feuerbach's anthropologism, man is only the biological man, and human nature is only biological nature. As to labor production by which man lives, social relations and class relations, in a word, as to the society in which man lives, it is entirely excluded from the sight of anthropologist philosophy.

Feuerbach did speak of man's collectivism ("organization"), of the unity of man with man, and intercourse. But because he had divorced himself from the social nature of man and historical development, all these are but the unity and intercourse among the "I," "you," and "he" in the masses of man (the organization of Feuerbach), or the unity (or co-existence) of the sexes.

In such "unity" and "intercourse", we still do not see the least bit of their production activities and the relations among men in the course of production. They are not linked together through reliance on material production relationships in society, but linked together through physiological feelings and desires. For instance, he also said, "If we reduce to the smallest scope the social basic nature of mankind, there at least exists the quest after the opposite sex."⁽¹⁾ It can thus be seen that the basic nature of human society means sexual relationship. This is a relationship of nature, and not a

(1) Ibid, p.581

relationship of labor production, not a class relationship. It can thus be seen that the man he understood never exceeded the scope of biology.

What, then, is the basic characteristic of man as understood by Marxism? In Outline of Feuerbach, Marx said, "In its actual condition, the basic characteristic of man is not the common-sense and unity between man and man based on natural and physiological conditions, but the sum total of social relationships based on the practice of social production." Marxist philosophy holds that there is no abstract man, and there does not exist in reality the so-called "living man of realism" in anthropologism, who is divorced from society, un-historical and non-class. In human society, the so-called real, concrete and living man is none other than the man in society, in history, in class society, that is, the class man. Marx pointed out that Feuerbach "can only explain the basic characteristic of man as a species, as a kind of inherent and dull commonness which links different people by relying on natural traits."⁽¹⁾ In this way, the basic characteristic of man becomes the "abstract thing owned by every person."

Today, is there anything new in the modern revisionist theory of human nature in addition to Feuerbach? Nothing. The

(1) See Engels: Feuerbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy, People's Publishing House 1959, p. 52.

revisionists only adopt the method of disguise to repeat the theories of Feuerbach and other bourgeois philosophers, to serve the interests of imperialism and the bourgeoisie.

The real content of the theory of human nature, like anthropologism, deletes the social character and class character of man; turns the things which plainly reveal the social relations and class relations of man into the common "nature" of mankind, to become permanent and unchangeable things, applicable to all ages, all nations and all classes.

For example, "parent love and fraternal feelings" are likened to "the old cow fondling the calf, and the crow feeding its parent," without distinction from one another, and so forth. In order to oppose the class struggle viewpoint of Marxism, one of the methods used by the human nature theorists is to seek help from the abstract and physiological man of Feuerbachian philosophy. Modern revisionists, like the bourgeois thinkers, talk about the abstract and general "human nature," the permanent "human nature" common to all people. But actually they propagate the bourgeois human nature, the bourgeois class character.

They advocate "humanitarianism" merely to ask the working class and the working people to discuss "humaneness" with the imperialists and the exploiting class, and to submit to the

counter revolutionary forces of imperialism and the bourgeoisie. They do not want the use of revolutionary brutal force to overthrow counter revolutionary brutal force. So this kind of theory of human nature is a tool of the bourgeoisie used against the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat.

II

Because anthropologism seeks to understand man merely from the physiological significance, to use the abstract man in place of the historical and class man, so there is left only the so-called "common human nature." In Feuerbach, the "basic nature of mankind" built on man's sensual desires is precisely "egoism" and the desire to seek happiness as well as "love."

In his work, "On Happiness," Feuerbach said, "Man's inner most basic character is not revealed in the theme "I am because I think," but in the theme "I am because I want "(1) This is to say, a man has desires from his birth, for in physiology, man is an organic body subject to the laws of nature, and "desire" is born to satisfy the needs of the organic body.

He said that man's every quest is a quest after happiness. So the quest after happiness is the supreme principle and the foundation of human ethics. In Feuerbach, health, life, sexual love and tasty food are all happiness. The quest after

(1) Selected Works of Feuerbach's Philosophy, Vol. I, p. 591

such happiness is the basic nature of man. Feuerbach held that if a man does not possess the desire for happiness, he will be devoid of human nature, and unethical. This will breed egoism.

For this reason, for Feuerbach, egoism is born naturally. He said, "What are my principles? They lie in the ego and another ego, in egoism and communism. Without egoism, you will not have your head. Without communism, you will not have your heart!" (1)

Feuerbach held that ethics begins with the obligation to serve oneself, that is, starting with the quest of individual happiness. And this is in harmony with "communism." Starting from the abstract "human nature," one reaches the stark bourgeois individualism. This is a major characteristic of the philosophy of Feuerbach's anthropologism.

Here, Feuerbach's so-called communism is a mass of people from the gathering of "ego" and "another ego", or of the two sexes. This "mass of people" must mutually accept the legitimacy of egoism. To Feuerbach, egoism and communism are united in egoism. Egoism is the head which directs everything. This is respect for and acceptance of another's egoism as legitimate, it is mutual love. The final goal is still egoism.

Modern revisionists copy the philosophy of Feuerbach's anthropologism, and advocate before the working class and the toiling people the extreme individualism of the bourgeoisie.

(1) Ibid, p. 259.

For example, modern revisionists use "individual happiness" in place of the Communist "common program," saying, "Socialism cannot make the individual happiness of man submit to any supreme goal, because the basic goal of socialism is man's individual happiness."

Pa Jen and the like also clamor: "Food and sex, the fragrance of flowers, the song of birds, are the common love and desire of everybody, things common among men in olden days and the present age, in this country and foreign lands." They also say, "First we want existence; second we want proper food and clothing; third we want development. These are the common desires of men universally."

Are these are but the slogans of bourgeois individualism. But they would make them universal "human nature" and propagate them, in the attempt to make the working people leave class struggle, to seek individual happiness, so as to realize the so-called demands common to mankind, love and hope. This is precisely a method used by the bourgeoisie today to oppose the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship.

Feuerbach makes egoism something naturally born, and basic nature of man. The revisionists are merely vending the goods of the bourgeoisie, to resist Communism under existing conditions. As a matter of fact, these viewpoints are but the

reflection of mercantile production in its ideological state. As early as in the 17th and 18th centuries. during the period of the bourgeois revolution in England and France, the bourgeois philosophers and thinkers all held such viewpoints. Hobbes held that man is an egoist from his birth. The French Revolutionists of the 18th century held it "the nature of man" to demand bourgeois order, freedom of trade and freedom of property. It is very clear that egoism is complete a bourgeois thing, it is the standard of ethics of the bourgeoisie, and is not anything like the "nature" common to mankind.

Egoism is incompatible with Communism and the working class world outlook. The modern revisionists made the final goal of Communism subservient to "individual happiness." This is a thorough revision of Marxism, the propagation of bourgeois ideology among the working people to pave the way for the restoration of capitalism.

Perhaps the human nature theorists will say "The egoism we speak of does not oppose Communism, because we still advocate love and advocate humanitarianism." Very well, let us take a look and see what really are the love and humanitarianism founded on anthropologism.

In Feuerbach, "love" was raised to the status of religion. He said, "There is no love, and/no truth."⁽¹⁾ He also

(1) Ibid. p. 169

said, "You should have faith. Yes, you should have faith. But your faith must be in the following: mankind must have real love, in his heart, a man can love without restraint and to the extent of excusing everything. The love of mankind can have the characteristic of divine love. Go ahead and love, but it must be real love. In this way, all other virtues will also come to you naturally."⁽¹⁾ He followed with the words that if man does not have the desire for love, he will be devoid of human nature.

It can thus be seen that "love" is "human nature." Starting from this point, Feuerbach held that though the Catholic Church considers, "God is love, God loves man, and man loves God," and thus made love sacred, it did not bestow on love the "human nature." So he advocated the use of the "love" of man for man, of parents for children, to replace the "love" of the Catholic Church, so that "love" may possess an anthropologic character.

The "love of mankind" referred to by Feuerbach is still based on the physiological viewpoint. He held that man can love a certain thing or object because that thing or object can make him feel interested and joyous. So the content of his "love" is no more than self love (love of one's ownself), love of children, and sexual love. His love superficially seems to transcend class. But in practice, in a society where man

(1) Ibid, 233

exploits man, the propagation of such abstract "love" without distinction of class is in itself providing a tool for the use of the bourgeoisie against the proletarian revolutionary struggle, and the class character is very strong. "Love yourself, but also love all men, including those of the other classes." The bourgeoisie precisely needs such a false slogan to support its rule. And this is also a reason why modern revisionists copy such theories from Feuerbach.

The "love" of Feuerbach is at the bottom self love, egoistic love. He said, "Without egoism, without self love, the love of other objects is the illusion of supra-naturalism, and it is love without love."⁽¹⁾ So love of others is also motivated by self love. However, love is mutual, and love must be exchanged with love. Starting from this point, Feuerbach brought forward the demand that we must "love people." That is to say, we must combine self profit with the profitting of others.

According to the theory of Feuerbach, self love and egoism are to make oneself happy; love of others and profitting others are to respect the rights of other people to seek happiness, and accept the egoism of others as legitimate. "My right is my desire to seek happiness as endorsed by law; my obligation is that I cannot but accept the desires of other people to seek

happiness." (1) This is the these of Fueurbach.

In the eyes of Fueurbach, the desire and acceptance of one's own quest for happiness and respect for other people's desire for happiness are at one. Accordingly, self-profitting and the profitting of other people are also harmonious. So he advocated conscience in dealing with others, that is, treating people with sincerity, frankness and earnestness. It would otherwise be unethical and not in conformity with "human nature." This is the spirit of bourgeois humanitarianism, the reflection of the concept in bourgeois society, on behalf of independent capital, for the freedom of trade, freedom of purchase and sale and freedom of property.

On this point, in Fueurbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy, Engels severely exposed and criticized the theory. He said, "From Fueurbach's ethical code we can draw the conclusion that the stock exchange is the supreme edifice of morals, if you speculate properly therein. If my desire to seek happiness leads me to the stock exchange, and if there I am ^{lucky} / enough to anticipate the results of my operations, so that they will only make me happy without incurring loss, that is to say, if I regularly win out in my gambles, then I shall have executed the order of Fueurbach. Please pay attention to the fact that here I have not obstructed my friends' desire to

(1) Ibid, p.389

seek happiness. My friends, like myself, also go to the stock exchange voluntarily. One of them is seeking his happiness in concluding a speculative deal with me, just as I am seeking my own happiness. If he loses, then it proves that his operations are unethical, because he failed to correctly anticipate results. Such is the real bourgeois content of Feuerbach's so-called harmony and unanimity between self profitting and profitting others. Such is the real content of the humanitarianism and love of mankind propagated by the modern revisionists.

We find that the modern revisionists are almost completely repeating the words of Feuerbach. They are separated from class and class struggle, separated from the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship, and are turning "humanitarianism" into something above everything else. It seems to them that the difficult struggle put up by the proletariat and the working people for the Communist cause is the struggle for humanitarianism, the only difference being that the present "humanitarianism" is "newer" than the "humanitarianism" of the past.

For example, on the eve of May Day in 1957, in a statement to the president and foreign editor of the newspaper "Combat", the rebel Tito stated that "the proletarian dictatorship must first be soaked in humanitarianism." He held that such "humanitarianism" meant that we must not enforce dictator-

ship (Tito slandered such dictatorship as retaliation) over the enemies of the proletariat and the working people and the counter revolutionaries, and we must not use revolutionary brutal force, claiming that such action "will still not weaken to the slightest degree the real quality of the proletarian dictatorship"! On the contrary he said that this would consolidate the dictatorship and make it understandable to the people.

Such is the so-called "proletarian dictatorship" of the rebel Tito. Such "proletarian dictatorship" is nothing but the demand to enforce "humanitarianism" against the enemy of the proletariat and the working people, and the counter revolutionaries. It is the abolition of revolutionary brutal force. On the question of the proletarian dictatorship, the rebel Tito is using bourgeois humanitarianism for the thorough abolition of revolutionary brutal force. In the eyes of Tito, the basic mark of proletarian dictatorship is "first have it soaked in humanitarianism," and is not revolutionary brutal force.

This is just as what Lenin pointed out in his criticism of the rebel Kautsky, "In giving a definition to dictatorship, Kautsky did his best to conceal before readers the basic mark of this concept, and this is, revolutionary brutal force." Lenin added, "Since Kautsky's interpretation of the concept of revolutionary proletarian dictatorship dismisses the use of revolutionary brutal force by the oppressed class against the

oppressor class, he is also using liberalism to misinterpret Marx and has broken the world record in this connection. Compared with rebel Kautsky, rebel Bernstein truly a kid."⁽¹⁾ In the same way, Tito has also created a world record in the use of bourgeois humanitarianism to distort Marxism. So compared with Tito, the old revisionist, rebel Kautsky is also virtually a kid.

In China, Pa Jen also brings forward the proposal to realize "the humanitarianism of the basic nature of mankind," and "love of mankind." There are people who hold that there is something common to the "humanitarianism" of different historical ages,"and that is, treat man as man, Treat man as man, for one's own self, signifies the safeguarding of one's own independent and sovereign rights. For other people, it signifies mutual acceptance and mutual respect between man and man." They turn bourgeois humanitarianism into the humanitarianism which permeates all historical ages. They use it to oppose the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship. This is the real content of the slogan "treat man as man."

In revisionism, the class character of humanitarianism has been completely obliterated to become something divorced from class and placed above everything else. Marxism holds that there has never been a common humanitarianism which is applicable

(1) Lenin: Oppose Revisionism, People's Publishing House, pp 362-3.

to all ages and all classes. From beginning to end, humanitarianism is connected with the class struggle under specific historical conditions. The revolutionary humanitarianism of the proletariat signifies a demand that the working class and the working people should hate all exploiters, hate imperialists, and hate the exploitation systems which create poverty, ignorance and suffering. They are also to wage an uncompromising struggle against the bourgeoisie and all reactionary groups, to eliminate all exploiting classes, and to realize the Communist society in which there is no exploitation of man by man. So the revolutionary humanitarianism is closely linked with the proletarian class struggle and the proletarian dictatorship. Separated from these, all talk about sympathy, and friendship is deceptive humanitarianism.

In a class society, is there really any "love of mankind" and "humanitarianism" that is separated from class and class struggle? No. Marxism holds that in a class society, there can be no pure and above class ethical relationships between man and man, such as the so-called feelings of sincerity, confidence, benevolence, understanding, tolerance . . . love. The stamp of class is on all these relationships.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has pointed out, "In the world there is no love without a reason. There is also no hate without a

reason. As to the love of mankind, since mankind was divided into classes, there has never been such united love. There will be real love of mankind, but only after the elimination of classes in the world. Classes have divided society into many opposed bodies. After the elimination of classes, there will be complete love of mankind. But at present there is none."⁽¹⁾

It can thus be seen that in a class society, there is basically no "feeling" or "love" that transcends classes. The working class and the bourgeoisie absolutely cannot love each other. There is also not the so-called right of mutual respect for the quest after happiness. The working class absolutely cannot love the bourgeoisie that is well fed, absolutely cannot respect the so-called right of the bourgeoisie to exploit and oppress the working class and the toiling people. It absolutely cannot express understanding and toleration of the bourgeoisie. It can only resolutely carry out the class struggle against the bourgeoisie.

In the same way, the bourgeoisie absolutely cannot love the working class, absolutely cannot tolerate and respect the working class.

Accordingly, in a class society, to talk of abstract "love of mankind" and "humanitarianism" is purely to deceive

⁽¹⁾ Address Before Literary Forum at Yenan. Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol. I, pp. 892-893.

the working class and the toiling people, to paralyze their class consciousness, and to make them leave the road of class struggle. In the period of transition from capitalism to Communism, to depart from the class and the class struggle, to abstractly discuss love of mankind and humanitarianism is nothing more than the attempt to oppose the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship.

In speaking on the so-called ethics of "love" of Feuerbach, Engels stated that the ethics of Feuerbach was completely in accord with the modern bourgeois society. He said, "In this way, the last vestige of the revolutionary character of his philosophy has also vanished. What is left is an old tune, love one another. Kiss one another irrespective of age and rank. Drink together in harmony." All this is true of the modern revisionists who talk of the so-called "love of mankind," and the humanitarianism of the basic nature of mankind.

Then, in a class society, can self-profitting and the profiting of others be united and harmonized? No. Between the exploiter and the exploited, what is profitable to the exploiter is not profitable to the exploited, and vice versa. For the bourgeoisie, he must harm others in order to profit himself, and to profit himself, he has to harm others. The greatest interest of the capitalist is the earning of the

biggest profits. For this he must cruelly exploit the workers, squeeze out of the workers the maximum surplus value. At the same time, he must also boycott other capitalists, and this is the so-called "large fish devouring the small fry." It is the ethics of all the bourgeoisie to profit themselves and harm others, to build their own happiness on the foundation of the sufferings of other people.

Between the hostile classes, there is basically no ethics that profits both oneself and the other. It is only in the struggle led by the working class for the elimination of the exploitation system, for opposition to imperialism, and it is only under the conditions of socialism and Communism with the thorough elimination of the exploitation system, that the individual interests of the working people and their collective interests can be united.

However, such unity calls for the subservience of individual interests to collective interests, and collective interests, including and representing individual interests, are united in Communism. But the Yugoslav revisionists put "individual happiness" and "supreme goal" opposed to each other, so that the working class and the toiling people only pay attention to the temporary interests of the present, and depart from class struggle, abandoning the supreme goal of Communism.

This is the diabolical plot of all revisionists and rightist opportunists to disintegrate the revolutionary will of the proletariat. It serves the interests of imperialism and the bourgeoisie.

In fact, this theory of profitting oneself and profitting others [egoism and altruism] the reflection of "exchange at par value" of commodities in the ideological field. As we know, in the capitalist society, the exchange of commodity rules everything. In the commodity market, the workers sell their labor, and the capitalist purchase their labor. I buy what you sell, and the bourgeoisie considers this very fair, being an exchange of value, and beneficial to both parties. This conceals the bourgeois cruel exploitation of the proletariat, and is stated to conform with "human nature" and is humanitarian. The advocates of the theory of human nature generally leave aside the realistic society and class relations, and talk about "human nature" and "humanitarianism" which are allegedly common to all and applicable to all societies and all classes. What is this other than deception?

It can thus be seen that whatever importance Feuerbach attached to man, and how he made man the starting point and the basis of his philosophy, because he studied man from the anthropological viewpoint, and made man an abstract and biological

man, taking away his social and class character, and used the common natural attribute to obliterate class differences. This must lead him from the materialist outlook of nature to the abyss of idealist social historical outlook.

On this point, Engels had pointed out, "Feuerbach did his utmost to grab the world of nature and man. But there his world of nature and man were still empty talk. He could not produce any accurate thing in regard to the realistic world of nature, or in regard to the realistic man." So Feuerbach never succeeded in finding the road from the abstract which he himself hated most, to the lively and realistic world. His so-called "quest after happiness," "egoism," and "love" did not register any step further than the humanitarianism of the earlier bourgeois thinkers. As to the so-called "individual happiness," "food, drink and sex," "the loyalty of a son," "love of mankind," and the so-called "humanitarianism of the basic nature of mankind," and so forth, they are not only the resurrection of Feuerbach's anthropologism under new historical conditions, but also represent a very reactionary retrogression.

III

In China, there are still people who say, "Of all the past literary works we have inherited as a valuable legacy, there may be many reasons which make them still enjoyed by the

people, but the most basic point is that they are immersed deeply in the spirit of humanitarianism...." We say that this is the bourgeois viewpoint of heritage.

We Marxists do want to inherit our legacy. But we do not inherit abstractly, we do not inherit our literary legacy without selection. We inherit critically and voluntarily. We are advocates of the theory of history, we use the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint, carry out a concrete analysis of the literary legacy, criticize it, seeing both its progressive significance under the historical conditions of its time, and also the historical limitations to which it was subjected, and pointing out the role it can play under present conditions.

Through analysis and criticism we inherit the essence of the legacy as a kind of nutrition for the development of culture. Even the portion which is the essence has still to be critically inherited and the dregs must be resolutely discarded. In the forties of the 19th century, Feuerbach brought forward in Germany his theory of human nature, humanitarianism to oppose feudal despotism, and to oppose divine rights. He had played a progressive role then. But what role can be played by the continued and persistent adherence to his viewpoints?

As everybody knows, our present age is basically different from the times of Feuerbach. The major characteristics of our age are found in the fact that "we are in the great new

era in which the collapse of the imperialist system is further accelerated, and the victory and awakening of the people of the whole world are being continually developed."⁽¹⁾ We are in the age of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the age of victory of socialism and Communism.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said, "The life of imperialism cannot be very long now." In our present age, class contradictions and class struggles are very acute.

In such circumstances, why do the revisionists of the present age pick up the bourgeois theory of human nature? Naturally they are not like Feuerbach who was opposing and attacking feudalism. Their sole aim is to weaken the revolutionary will of the working class and the toiling people, to undermine the people's revolutionary movement in capitalist countries and colonies.

Modern revisionists willingly submit to the will of imperialism and the bourgeoisie, slander the revolutionary struggle of the awakened peoples of all countries of the world, and the proletarian dictatorship in the socialist countries, saying that it is not in conformity with human nature and humanitarianism. They demand that the people of socialist countries, the oppressed and exploited peoples of all countries, cultivate "human sympathy and friendly love" for imperialism led by the United States, aid for the bourgeoisie, and to re-

(1) Lu Ting-i: Unite Under the Revolutionary Banner of Lenin, see Long Live Leninism, People's Publishing House, p.91.

frain from resolute struggle against them.

In a word, they want the people of the capitalist countries to tolerate exploitation and not to launch a revolution; they want the working people in the colonial and semi colonial countries to tolerate imperialist aggression and plunder and not to rise for the overthrow of imperialism and colonial rule. Is this not clearly a demand that the people submit themselves to imperialism and the bourgeoisie? If it is not the betrayal of the revolution, what is it?

Since liberation, under the wise leadership of the Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung, China has achieved colossal victory on the march toward socialism. Today, the socialist revolution and socialist construction are being penetratingly developed. They are marching forward in the midst of the struggle between two classes, between two roads.

The anti-socialist bourgeoisie and all other anti-socialist elements would carry out stubborn resistance, carry out their dying struggle. As we know, in the movement for the ideological remolding of intellectuals, some people had used the theory of human nature (which has been a weapon in the hands of those who resist) to attack the movement, saying that ideological remolding was not compatible with human nature, not compatible with human feelings.

With the decisive victory of the socialist revolution

on the economic front, we have launched the revolution on the political and ideological fronts. At this juncture, Pa Jen and others have again put up the theory of human nature, to attack and slander our socialist society as lacking in human feelings, and human nature, and not treating man as man.

In 1958, under the illumination of the Party's general line of socialist construction, the people of China achieved the great victories of the big leap forward and the people's communes, and the socialist revolution developed further. With the building of the people's communes, not only has the socialist system of public ownership been expanded and elevated, but the collectivization of living has also been realized, so as to greatly consolidate the base of socialism.

All this must lead to stubborn resistance from the bourgeoisie and a small portion of the well-to-do middle peasants who linger after the capitalist road. At this juncture, another small group of people have elected to speak for the bourgeoisie. They bring up the false slogan of "freedom, equality and universal love," the slogan of bourgeois humanitarianism, to oppose the continuation of the socialist revolution to its end. We see that when Pa Jen and his like advocate their theory of human nature and humanitarianism, they resort to all ways and means to cover up the class nature of these things, making them to be things which transcend classes, and applicable to

all societies and all classes. The aim is to oppose socialism and thence to restore capitalism.

It can thus be seen that under present conditions, the bourgeois theory of human nature and humanitarianism are completely reactionary. Their role is nothing more than opposition to the proletarian revolution and the proletarian dictatorship. The proletariat absolutely cannot inherit as a "precious legacy" such a bourgeois world outlook. On the contrary, we must use the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism to make a thorough exposure and criticism of bourgeois humanitarianism and its philosophical foundation, anthropologism.

✓ 2044

END